RIVER AND HARBOR AND FLOOD CONTROL OMNIBUS BILL, 1959

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

JUL 27 1959

MAIN READING ROOM

(No. 86-9)

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

EIGHTY-SIXTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT IN THE UNITED STATES

MAY 12, 13, 14, 21, 26, AND 27, 1959

Printed for the use of the Committee on Public Works

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
41905 WASHINGTON : 1959

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

CHARLES A. BUCKLEY, New York, *Chairman*

GEORGE H. FALLON, Maryland
CLIFFORD DAVIS, Tennessee
JOHN A. BLATNIK, Minnesota
ROBERT E. JONES, Alabama
FRANK E. SMITH, Mississippi
JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI, Illinois
T. A. THOMPSON, Louisiana
IRIS FAIRCLOTH BLITCH, Georgia
JIM WRIGHT, Texas
W. R. HULL, JR., Missouri
KENNETH J. GRAY, Illinois
FRANK M. CLARK, Pennsylvania
ED EDMONDSON, Oklahoma
JOHN J. McFALL, California
CHARLES H. (CHARLIE) BROWN, Missouri
GRACIE PFOST, Idaho
JOHN YOUNG, Texas
DENVER D. HARGIS, Kansas
FRANK W. BURKE, Kentucky
HAROLD T. JOHNSON, California
ROBERT E. COOK, Ohio

JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, New Jersey
RUSSELL V. MACK, Washington
GORDON H. SCHERER, Ohio
GARDNER R. WITHROW, Wisconsin
WILLIAM C. CRAMER, Florida
JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR., California
FRED SCHWENGEL, Iowa
EDWIN B. DOOLEY, New York
WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD, Michigan
HOWARD W. ROBISON, New York
DEAN P. TAYLOR, New York
WALTER M. MUMMA, Pennsylvania

MARGARET R. BEITER, *Chief Clerk*
RICHARD J. SULLIVAN, *Chief Counsel*
JOSEPH R. BRENNAN, *Engineer-Consultant*
ROBERT F. MCCONNELL, *Minority Counsel*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

JOHN A. BLATNIK, Minnesota, *Chairman*

GEORGE H. FALLON, Maryland
CLIFFORD DAVIS, Tennessee
IRIS FAIRCLOTH BLITCH, Georgia
JOHN J. McFALL, California
CHARLES H. (CHARLIE) BROWN, Missouri
JOHN YOUNG, Texas
DENVER D. HARGIS, Kansas
FRANK W. BURKE, Kentucky
HAROLD T. JOHNSON, California
ROBERT E. COOK, Ohio

JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, New Jersey
WILLIAM C. CRAMER, Florida
EDWIN B. DOOLEY, New York
WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD, Michigan
GORDON H. SCHERER, Ohio
DEAN P. TAYLOR, New York

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

CLIFFORD DAVIS, Tennessee, *Chairman*

FRANK E. SMITH, Mississippi
ROBERT E. JONES, Alabama
T. A. THOMPSON, Louisiana
JIM WRIGHT, Texas
W. R. HULL, JR., Missouri
KENNETH J. GRAY, Illinois
FRANK M. CLARK, Pennsylvania
GRACIE PFOST, Idaho
DENVER D. HARGIS, Kansas
HAROLD T. JOHNSON, California

RUSSELL V. MACK, Washington
GARDNER R. WITHROW, Wisconsin
JOHN F. BALDWIN, Jr., California
FRED SCHWENGEL, Iowa
HOWARD W. ROBISON, New York
WALTER M. MUMMA, Pennsylvania

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

CONTENTS

	Page
Text of—	
H.R. 109	103
H.R. 802	33
H.R. 1074	28
H.R. 2191	29
H.R. 5515	30
Testimony of—	
Baumhart, Hon. Albert D., Jr., a Representative in Congress from the State of Ohio	77
Becker, Hon. Frank J., a Representative in Congress from the State of New York	20
Burnett, C. H., Jr., general manager of the Kahului Railroad Co., Maui, Hawaii	21
Burns, Hon. John A., a Delegate at Large from the State of Hawaii; accompanied by C. H. Burnett, Jr., general manager of the Kahului Railroad Co., Maui, Hawaii	21
Byrnes, Hon. John W., a Representative in Congress from the State of Wisconsin	59
Eaton, Richard, chief technical adviser, Beach Erosion Board	83
Gullatt, Doswell, assistant to vice president, Waterways, Association of American Railroads	124
Heller, Frank, Corps of Engineers, Army	28
Johnson, Charles, port director, Port Mansfield, Tex	16
Kilgore, Hon. Joe M., a Representative in Congress from the State of Texas; accompanied by Charles Johnson, port director, Port Mansfield, Tex	16
McRae, Angus H., Assistant Chief of Civil Works, Corps of Engineers, Army	51, 93
Nauman, Col. Arthur, Assistant Chief of Civil Works, Corps of Engineers, Army	53, 71, 91
Parsons, Lt. Col. L. A., Assistant Chief of Civil Works, Office, Chief of Engineers	13, 29, 107
Perkins, Hon. Carl D., a Representative in Congress from the State of Kentucky	33
Person, Brig. Gen. John L., Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works	1, 118, 121
Quie, Hon. Albert H., a Representative in Congress from the State of Minnesota	53
Smith, Col. Stephen E., Assistant Chief of Civil Works, Corps of Engineers, Army	26, 64, 89, 105
Vivian, Lt. Col. James A., Corps of Engineers, Army	33
Williams, Hon. John Bell, a Representative in Congress from the State of Mississippi, accompanied by Arlie C. Warren, president, Adams County Board of Supervisors, and Oak Duke, manager, Natchez Association of Commerce, Natchez, Miss	96
Willis, Hon. Edwin E., a Representative in Congress from the State of Louisiana	49
Wolf, Hon. Leonard G., a Representative in Congress from the State of Iowa	55

Additional information:
Association of American Railroads, letter, June 3, 1959, signed, Doswell Gullatt, with list of membership — Page 129
Comprehensive river basin plans, table — 124
Fascell, Dante B., a Representative in Congress from the State of Florida, telegram, May 13, 1959, in Key West — 87
Great Lakes reports in process:
Interim, scheduled for submission — 77
List — 73
Non-Federal contribution — 75
Jennings, Hon. W. Pat, a Representative in Congress from the State of Virginia, submitted statements:
John W. Flannagan Dam and Reservoir — 104
Pound River — 118
Kewaunee Harbor Commission, City of, Wisconsin, letter, May 12, 1959, signed Don W. Jirtle, chairman — 63
Knox, Hon. Victor A., a Representative in Congress from the State of Michigan, submitted statement — 62
Marinette Chamber of Commerce, letter, May 12, 1959, signed, George S. Robbins, manager — 63
McIntire, Hon. Clifford G., a Representative in Congress from the State of Maine, submitted statement — 66
Natchez Port County, Miss., summary of proposed costs, 1958–61 — 100
National Rivers and Harbors Congress, letter, June 5, 1959, with reports:
Irrigation committee — 41
Industrial water use, pollution, abatement, wildlife, and recreation — 45
Projects committee — 35
Resolutions committee — 39
Teague, Hon. Olin E., a Representative in Congress from the State of Texas, statement re Bardwell Reservoir — 109
Wiginton, Al. F., president Bay City Chamber of Commerce, telegram, May 13, 1959 — 88
List of projects:
Bardwell Reservoir, Waxahachie Creek, Tex. (H. Doc. 424, 85th Cong.) — 107
Bayous Petit Anse, Tigre, and Carlin, La. (S. Doc. 70); Bayou Lafourche, La. (H. Doc. 112) — 49
Blackstone River, R. I. (S. Doc. 87, 85th Cong.) — 89
Columbia Basin — 121
Connoquenessing Creek at Butler, Pa. (H. Doc. 110, 86th Cong.) — 91
Cotuit Harbor, Mass — 26
Favorable flood control survey resolutions — 113
Great Lakes harbors — 71
Kahului Harbor, island of Maui, T.H. (H. Doc. 109, 86th Cong.) — 18
Kewaunee Harbor, Wis — 57
Key West, Fla — 83
Menominee Harbor and River, Wis. and Mich. (H. Doc. 113) — 58
Mississippi River at Dubuque, Iowa — 54
Mojave River, Calif — 112
Moriches and Shinnecock Inlets, N.Y — 67
Natchez, Miss., harbor improvements at (S. Doc. 16, 86th Cong.) — 93
Port Mansfield, Tex — 13
Red Wing Harbor, Minn. (H. Doc. 32) — 52
Shem Creek, S.C — 68
Southwest Harbor, Maine — 64
Stonington Harbor, Maine — 65
Walnut Creek Basin, Calif. (H. Doc. 76, 86th Cong.) — 109

RIVER AND HARBOR AND FLOOD CONTROL OMNIBUS BILL, 1959

TUESDAY, MAY 12, 1959

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
Washington, D.C.

The committee met, pursuant to call, at 10:30 a.m., in room 1302, New House Office Building, Hon. John A. Blatnik presiding.

Mr. BLATNIK. The House Public Works Committee will please come to order.

We are opening a series of public hearings on resolutions and bills pertaining to various rivers and harbors projects. We will open the hearings this morning with a comprehensive review statement showing all of the projects, not only rivers and harbors, but flood control, erosion and other multiple-purpose projects which are to be considered by this committee.

We are very, very pleased to have with us this morning a most effective and valuable representative of the Corps of Engineers, who has been of great assistance to this committee for a long time. It is certainly a very special personal pleasure to call upon Brig. Gen. John L. Person, the Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works of the Army Corps of Engineers, to give us his summary statement on matters that have already come before this committee, and he will project into the immediate future in a discussion of the nature of the problems that confront this committee.

General, we welcome you.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Chairman, is this the beginning of hearings to bring about the enactment of the river and harbor bill?

Mr. BLATNIK. Not the statement itself.

Mr. MACK. No. I mean the hearings.

Mr. BLATNIK. The hearings themselves will be. Yes, sir.

General, it is a special privilege to have you open the public hearings.

STATEMENT OF BRIG. GEN. JOHN L. PERSON, ASSISTANT CHIEF OF ENGINEERS FOR CIVIL WORKS

General PERSON. Thank you, sir.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee; it is a pleasure, as it has always been, to appear before your committee. This is an especially important occasion to me, since in view of my impending retirement it will probably be my last appearance before your full committee as a representative of the Corps of Engineers. I have, therefore, given considerable thought to the statement which I am about to make.

I know that your purpose is to consider, and possibly report out, another omnibus river and harbor and flood control bill. Since enactment of the last legislation of this kind in July 1958 the Chief of Engineers has recommended a number of new projects or modifications of existing projects. These will be considered in detail and representatives of the Corps as well as interested local agencies will be called on to testify concerning them, if past procedures are followed.

I feel, therefore, that rather than discuss these new proposals at this time I can serve you best, and best serve the cause of water resources development, by reviewing the road we have traveled in development of the civil works program, and by presenting to the best of my ability and experience some of the more urgent problems that are developing in the water resources segment of the public works activity, and some thoughts on what may be done about them.

I have had the good fortune to be involved in the planning and construction of civil works improvements for the major part of my 30 years' service with the Army. The span of my service, therefore, has covered the period of the greatest expansion of Federal activity in this field, since by far the greatest progress on a nationwide basis has taken place since 1936 when the first general flood control legislation was enacted by Congress.

The roots of this activity, of course, go much deeper into the history of our country, to 1824, in fact, when the first river improvements were authorized by Congress and undertaken by the corps. For almost a century thereafter, the Federal interest and activity in this field was limited largely to improvement of navigation on our rivers and harbors. During the past half century, however, we have witnessed a growing interest in water resources development of all kinds and an ever increasing expansion of the Federal participation in this activity.

CIVIL WORKS ACCOMPLISHMENTS

This Federal activity in cooperation with States and local organizations has resulted in accomplishment of a major public works program which has produced large public benefits.

In the field of navigation we have over the years improved some 23,000 miles of waterways which includes some 10,000 miles of channels which provide depths of over 9 feet for modern barge transportation. Traffic on these waterways has increased over the past 30 years from 8 billion ton-miles in 1929 to 115 billion ton-miles in 1957. We have also improved some 500 harbors on the Atlantic, gulf and Pacific coasts, on the Great Lakes, and in Alaska, and in the oversea Territories.

In the field of flood control we have completed or placed in operation 151 flood control and multiple-purpose reservoirs, and nearly 300 works for local flood protection. We estimate that these have prevented flood damages of over $9 billion to date which is almost three times the cost of the flood control improvements.

I think that is important, especially when you recognize that the general flood control program only started in 1936. We have already saved almost three times the cost, and the structures are still there.

These works are effective in most of our major river basins and on many smaller rivers and streams. The degree of protection varies, however, and is far from complete in many areas.

The large multiple-purpose projects, 32 in number, which have been constructed, produce a variety of benefits. Over 6 million kilowatts of power have been installed. During 1958 these projects produced 27 billion kilowatt-hours of power or about 20 percent of all the hydropower generated in the United States. The increasing importance of these multiple-purpose and flood control reservoirs for water supply is shown by the fact that at 18 completed projects we have more than 1,200,000 acre-feet under contract for municipal and industrial water supply; and, in addition, releases of water for irrigation totaled 1,600,000 acre-feet in 1958. These reservoirs, and others where conservation pools are provided, have developed into a major recreational resource. They make available about 3 million acres of water area at normal pool levels. In 1958 attendance at these projects totaled 95 million visitor-days, which is more than double the attendance 5 years ago.

I have for distribution to you a statistical summary of these accomplishments which you may find of interest.

These accomplishments have been brought about by the program that so many people are fond of referring to as pork barrel. It makes me mad every time I hear the term.

There are a number of salient factors which have contributed to and have been an essential part of this growth, and all of these have involved the deliberations and actions of this committee.

DEVELOPMENT OF WATER RESOURCES LAW

Of primary importance has been the gradual evolution of a great mass of Federal legislation dealing with water resources. The Federal activity in flood control was extended beyond the alluvial valley of the Mississippi for the first time in 1893 when Congress established the California Debris Commission. The act of March 3, 1909, provided for inclusion of data on development and use of water power in reports to the Congress. The act of March 4, 1913, provided a legislative basis for reports to Congress on water projects and first required consideration of related water uses on a comprehensive basis. The act of March 1, 1917, authorized flood control construction in California and in the alluvial valley of the Mississippi and made river and harbor laws applicable to flood control. The act of June 5, 1920, required the Chief of Engineers to recommend local cooperation for special benefits that would accrue from projects.

The very important River and Harbor Acts of 1925 and 1927 authorized the so-called 308 surveys, which were the first attempt to appraise the resources and problems of all the rivers of the United States. These were largely completed by the Corps during the ensuing decade. These studies provided a basis for much work undertaken for relief of unemployment during the early 1930's, were a basis for the TVA plan of development, and for many improvements authorized by subsequent flood control acts. The act of May 15, 1927, authorized the present major project for control of floods in the alluvial valley of the Mississippi.

Perhaps the most significant piece of legislation, however, was the act of June 22, 1936, which established for the first time a national policy for Federal participation in flood control on a nationwide

basis. That act has been amended and extended by omnibus river and harbor legislation in 1938, 1941, 1944, 1946, 1950, 1954, and 1958. While all of these acts authorized specific projects, they also included important general legislation which has expanded and clarified the Federal interest in almost every phase of water resource development, including: Provisions to preserve for future use the hydroelectric power potential of projects; recognition of rights and interests of States; coordination with other Federal agencies such as the Departments of Interior and Agriculture; recognition of major drainage as a part of flood control; provision of facilities for access and public use, for recreation and conservation of fish and wildlife; provision for disposal of hydroelectric power by the Secretary of Interior; a very important one in the last omnibus bill, provision for planning for municipal and industrial water supply and for its disposal; recognition of recreational navigation; and authority for accomplishment of flood fighting, emergency work and small justified projects, which has been most useful and most helpful.

In addition there have been related acts which have clarified the Federal interest in such matters as control of beach erosion; protection against flooding by hurricanes in coastal areas; and increased recognition of fish and wildlife preservation as a project purpose.

We are often inclined to think of these laws in their narrower sense of providing a vehicle for authorization of specific projects. And we still use the terminology of flood control law or river and harbor law. The fact that these same acts provide the present broad basis for Federal participation in almost every phase of water resources development is seldom recognized. It would be much more accurate to characterize these acts as Federal water resources law. I believe they should be dignified by a greater recognition of their real import.

This body of law has developed in a gradual and practical way to meet needs as they have arisen. One result of this procedure, and the broad program that has developed, has been stimulation of wide interest in water resources development. As a result, this subject has been studied by numerous commissions and committees of the legislative and executive branch. These studies have led to legislative proposals, generally broad in scope. Some of these proposals have never reached the Congress, while some bills of this kind are now before the Congress for consideration. Many have merit, but most proposals of this kind cover so many aspects of the problem that they unavoidably attract strong opposition as well as support. It seems to me that the experience of this committee over the years affords a valuable lesson—that development of water resources legislation is a matter of evolution, rather than revolution, a step-by-step process, based on practical needs and experience.

MULTIPLE-PURPOSE DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING

Perhaps the most significant change that has grown out of this expanded Federal interest in water resources has been the shift in emphasis from single-purpose to multiple-purpose development; and from planning for some particular project to comprehensive and coordinated river basin planning.

As our country has grown and developed during the past half century, and particularly during the past decade of almost explosive growth in population and industry, it has become apparent that our rivers must be developed to meet all present needs and to serve as fully as possible the needs of the foreseeable future.

I think the Corps of Engineers has felt the impact of this change more than any other Federal agency. Thirty years ago, when the Congress authorized the corps to make a study—even such a broad study of many rivers as the 308 surveys—it was possible and proper for us to proceed almost unilaterally. There were so many obvious needs for navigation and flood control projects that selection and recommendation of individual worthwhile projects was a relatively simple task.

Those days have gone forever. The rising interest in water resources development is now shared by many Federal agencies, by the States to an increasing degree, and by industry and organizations of private citizen. Many of these have broad interests while others, human nature being what it is, tend to support some particular phase or interest, to the exclusion of all others. And the inherent conflicts in use of water have been intensified by increasing demands upon a limited supply.

The pattern of study, therefore, that has emerged and is continuing to emerge, is one of comprehensive river basin studies in which other Federal agencies, the States, and private organizations all cooperate in their respective fields of interest. Such studies, for example, are now underway in the Delaware and Potomac River Basins; and our review of the plan for the Columbia River Basin, which will soon be submitted to the Congress, was also made on that basis.

This is a sound development as it insures that the skills and information available to the various Federal agencies and States are brought to bear on solution of these complex water problems. It does, however, require patient and difficult coordination and efforts to resolve conflicting interests. It also involves consideration of many phases of river basin development which are emerging now as of major importance and as difficult problems. Thus comprehensive and multiple-purpose planning is not an easy task, but I believe we are making progress.

We have given much attention to the requirements of coordination. I appeared recently before your Subcommittee on Watershed Development and described the relationship between our flood control program and the flood prevention program being developed by the Department of Agriculture under Public Law 566. At that time I told you that we have a working task group composed of representatives of the Soil Conservation Service and Corps of Engineers who are attempting to resolve differences and achieve coordination and uniformity in conduct of these programs. In January of this year we were able to complete a memorandum of agreement covering, at least in part, the participation by the two agencies in urban flood protection.

Enactment of the Water Supply Act of 1958 in July of last year, title III of the last omnibus bill, has led us to seek and reach an agreement with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This will further implement our past close relations with the Public Health Service in the field of water supply investigations. We desire and have been promised their assistance in appraising needs for water

supply and in evaluating it. This would be somewhat analogous to the manner in which the Federal Power Commission now assists us in estimating power needs and in evaluating hydroelectric power.

In addition we are continuing our efforts in working with the Interagency Committee on Water Resources, and through informal interagency committees, to arrive at uniform and mutually acceptable procedures for project evaluation, cost allocation, and cost sharing. We are making great progress in that respect.

One of the most important and productive areas of coordination is that which involves the States. As you know, the 1944 Flood Control Act specifically requires coordination with affected States in our planning. Experience has shown us that progress is greatly facilitated when there is a strong State interest in conservation and use of its waters. In particular we have found that much can be accomplished, and this is much easier, when there are strong State organizations with which we can deal during the entire planning and construction procedure. In addition many States, particularly those in the more humid parts of the country, are showing an increasing interest in clarifying their own water laws. We are trying to encourage more positive and effective State participation in civil works.

NEW WATER RESOURCES PROBLEMS

In addition to the problems of agency and State coordination we are confronted with many new problems of river development. These have received some consideration in the past—but largely as incidental to the matters in which there has been an accepted Federal interest. Now, however, such matters as regulation of flow for water supply and other purposes, abatement of pollution, preservation and enhancement of fish and wildlife, regulation of flood plain use, and recreation are pressing for recognition as important problems and purposes of river basin development.

For many years we have recognized, since 1936, the need for regulation of the high flows of rivers, or control of floods. The economic drain upon our resources imposed by recurring flood losses was obvious. Somewhat less obvious 20 years ago was the need for regulation of rivers for all purposes. This need, however, has now been made plain by the recent succession of drought years in the Southwest, by the crowding of industry to riverbanks in search of water and economic bulk transportation, and by the increasing pollution of our rivers.

I predict that as time goes on the regulation and improvement of low water discharges of our rivers may become even more important than regulation of flood flows. This is merely a part of the multiple-purpose concept under which we hold that our rivers must be developed for all purposes.

Conservation interests throughout the country have for many years been intensely interested in preservation of fish and wildlife values in connection with water resources development. In the past, however, their approach has been somewhat negative—largely opposition to river development and at best an insistence that loss and damage be prevented. The new fish and wildlife coordination act provides a more positive approach which we welcome. It gives greater stature to fish and wildlife as a project purpose and recognizes the possibility

of enhancement of benefits as well as mitigation of losses. We are extremely anxious to establish a working relationship under which the fish and wildlife resource can be evaluated and provided for as one of the real purposes of water resources projects. To this end conservationists and engineers must learn to talk the same language to work out mutual problems.

It is becoming increasingly apparent that river valleys will be developed and used regardless of the flood hazard. The economic advantages of valley lands are so great that this growth seems inevitable. While we have made great progress in providing flood control works, many of our river valleys are still subject to destructive floods, and the degree of protection varies widely. Moreover, it will probably not be possible, because of physical and economic limitations, to provide full flood protection. This leads to the inescapable conclusion that greater attention must be given by States, municipalities, and industry, and by the Federal agencies concerned with development, to some form of regulation of flood plain use. I do not suggest an attempt to prevent any such use, but an intelligent appraisal of the hazards involved when these lands are used. We should be as much concerned with avoidance of creating a future flood hazard as with means of correcting the damage after it occurs.

Another emerging problem or potentiality of river basin development that has been assuming increasing importance is recreation. When most of our flood control and multiple-purpose reservoirs were authorized and built, little if any consideration was given to their recreational potential. Congress, however, in the Flood Control Act of 1944 was farsighted enough to give us rather broad authority to provide facilities for access and public use so that the potential of these projects for recreation and for fish and wildlife could be realized. As a result our records show that in 1958 the recreational use of projects under the jurisdiction of the corps totaled about 95 million visitor-days. This real and tangible value of water resource development can no longer be ignored as a project purpose. It is becoming so important that we must consider and provide for recreational use in project planning.

These are some of the important outstanding problems which confront those who are now engaged in water resources planning. I could name others, but I believe those I have mentioned are sufficient to raise the question as to how we can best accomplish the complex coordinated planning that will be necessary if future needs are to be met.

WATER RESOURCE PLANNING

There have been numerous proposals over the years, and experiments, in carrying out water resources planning. These have run the gamut from single-purpose studies by a single agency to the present coordinated studies with full interagency and State participation. There have been proposals for valley authorities such as TVA. More recently the President's Water Resources Policy Commission recommended the establishment of an Executive Review Board and separate river basin commessions, which would coordinate and review the activities of the Federal and State agencies.

During the last session of Congress, two study commissions were authorized, one for southeastern rivers and one for the State of

Texas. These commissions are now recruiting staffs and building organizations. The Corps of Engineers is represented on the Commissions along with other Federal agencies. We are not yet sure just what the functions and activities of these new organizations will be, but we stand ready to provide all possible assistance. Presumably study commissions of this kind will report to the Congress through this Public Works Committee.

It is obvious, therefore, that there are a number of ways in which the Federal Government can participate with States and local organizations in water resources planning. We feel confident, or I feel confident at least, that regardless of the organizational arrangements that may ultimtely evolve, the experience of the Corps of Engineers will be needed and you may be sure that we will cooperate as in the past with whatever organizational arrangements the Congress may establish.

In any event, I feel very strongly that in our present and future planning for water resources development we must look forward to future needs, rather than to the past and present. In many river basins the more obviously needed projects have been built, or authorized by Congress for construction. But we know that the flood problem has not been solved and that future demands for water will increase. Our approach must therefore be a broad gauge appraisal of how river basins and regions are likely to develop over the next 50 to 100 years and of the resources and developments that will be required to meet those needs. We can then proceed to develop the plans which are feasible to provide the water, power, and flood protection that will be required.

Some elements of such plans may not be needed and may not be justified for some years to come, but framework plans of this kind would enable us to proceed with the works needed under present conditions with assurance that what we do now will fit in with and not preclude the more complete developments that will be essential in the years to come.

In closing at this time I should like to express my very real and sincere appreciation of the friendly and understanding attitude which this committee has always shown me. It has been a major factor in making my present assignment, which I am shortly to leave, one of the most interesting and satisfying jobs of my career, and I do appreciate it.

Mr. BLATNIK. General, I am sure I may state in behalf of the committee our most sincere appreciation for your presentation here, which was not only a comprehensive and succinct statement covering an area of broad scope, but was a statement which ranged over a period of time covering centuries, during which time, as you point out, we had an evolution and development of our entire water uses, conservation and preservation programs under the jurisdiction of the House Public Works Committee. You have also pointed out and given us guide lines to follow in considering problems in the future.

It is amazing that water, which is our greatest resource should be taken for granted. Water, is the most common, the most ordinary, but at the same time the most vital resource we have. In this new era of technology we are solving many of the resource shortage problems confronting us. We have solved many of them recently, involv-

ing such resources as gas, tin, hemp, rubber, gasoline, vanadium, and all of the items necessary for the manufacture of jet engines and missiles, as well as uranium, isotopes, and atomic energy. However, it is suddenly dawning upon many of us that with our rapid increase in population and the heavy demands for water accompanying it that it is almost ironical that in the immediate future the resource which will be greatest in demand and shortest in supply will be not some rare metal in the field of metallurgy, like uranium or vanadium, and not some exotic fuel, like the different solid fuels for missile propellants, but the simple, common, everyday, ordinary, commonplace item of water. This will be the problem that will be the hardest to lick.

General, you have done a great service to the committee and to the Congress in very effectively summing up and wrapping up this whole problem, and taking a look not only at where we are, but where we have come from, or, as it is said, from whence we come to where we are, in order that we may better determine where we are to go. I congratulate you most heartily and commend you most sincerely on this statement.

General PERSON. Thank you very much, sir.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Smith.

Mr. SMITH. I want to join in the commendation for General Person. This fine statement he has made today indicated the very broad grasp of the water resources problem which he has, and is indicative of the service he has given the Corps of Engineers throughout our country, as well as in his work as Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works. The committee has been very fortunate to be able to work with him.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Auchincloss.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. I think General Person has done a great service to this committee and to the Congress in making a statement of this kind. It is comprehensive and it is intelligent, and it is very great and worthwhile to all of us who are concerned with all of these great water resource problems with which you have been working.

I want to express my very sincere and strong feeling, Mr. Chairman, that I regret that this one brigadier general has to retire. I wish he were going to be along with us for a long time. We are going to miss him. He has been a great help to our committee. He has always been in our service and has done his duty with thoughtfulness and consideration, which is tremendously appreciated. In the days to come, General, I and I am sure my colleagues, wish you well, and we hope you come back once in a while so we can shake your hand.

General PERSON. Thank you very much, sir.

Mr. DAVIS. I would like to associate myself with these fine statements made about our longtime friend, General Person.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Mack.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Chairman and General. In my 13 years of experience as a member of the House Public Works Committee, the Committees on Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control, there have come before this committee the representatives of nearly every agency and department of the Federal Government. Without disparaging any

of the witnesses from other departments I do want to say that in my opinion the representatives of the Army Engineers have been the best informed, the most helpful, the most constructive, and ablest witnesses that have come before this committee. Of that group of distinguished witnesses who have come before this committee, General, you have been unsurpassed. You have rendered a great service to this committee, to the Congress, and a very great service to the people of this Nation in promoting its defense and its economic well-being.

I know I express the opinion of all the members of this committee when I say that our best wishes go with you, that we are going to miss you very much, because you will not advise and counsel us on the great water problems of the Nation.

General PERSON. Thank you very much, sir.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I feel the same as everybody on this committee. We are going to miss you. General, it is men like you that made the Corps of Engineers the outstanding agency of the Federal Government. In your retirement I wish you every success. We are going to miss you.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I want to say one word to associate myself with what has been said and further to congratulate you, General, on your very distinguished service to the organization you are connected with.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Gray.

Mr. GRAY. I want to join my chairman and my fellow colleagues on the committee in extending my best wishes to General Person as he leaves this important post. We wish you the best of health and happiness as you go down life's pathway. If it is in order at this time I would like to ask the general a question.

It is apparent our rivers must be developed to meet all our present needs as fully as possible and the needs of the future. I think that is the crux of your multiple-purpose planning section, which was a very fine presentation. We all agree on that, but the real question is how we will best develop these rivers.

My question is whether or not you are familiar with the bill introduced by our great majority leader, Mr. McCormack, modifying local contributions where communities are not able to come up with the amount specified in the rivers and harbors bills that have been passed. I wonder if the Corps of Engineers has taken any position on that measure or if you care to comment on it?

General PERSON. No, sir. I have not had a chance to review it as yet.

Mr. GRAY. It is a bill that modifies the local cash contribution where communities can show they have a feasible project but due to economic factors which exist there they are not able to come up with the cash contribution required in the law. I understand that it went over to the Corps of Engineers for comment. It was introduced by our majority leader, Mr. McCormack. I think it is a very important bill because I believe we have many projects throughout the country like in my district, the Saline River project which is authorized for $5,900,000 and we are absolutely not able to come up with the cash contribution on the criteria laid down by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget.

If we could get that type of legislation enacted then certainly some of these projects could go forward which could not otherwise, due to the fact that local communities, through loss of population and other factors, are not able to pay the amount required.

It is a very important bill and I thought possibly you might have some comments on it.

General PERSON. I have not personally seen it yet but I will, of course.

Mr. GRAY. Thank you very much, and again I extend my congratulations.

Mr. BLATNIK. General, not to cut this short or stop any questions, but after the splendid presentation you have made here I want to take this opportunity to express my own sentiments. I am concerned, and so are many, many of our colleagues who have approached us as to when we can get further authorizations. I am concerned about the stop order issued by the administration with regard to new starts.

I do not want to put you on record. You are here to advise us on the engineering, technical, and fiscal aspects of these various projects. Your statement pointed out not only the increased need for water resources development, but the more complex character of our approach to these water problems involving all of the integrated operations of several Federal agencies with State agencies and local units participating. I just do not see any justification for slowing up and dropping down to low gear and dragging along when we should be sliding into overdrive and really rolling in this program.

This is a resource program which is not only to serve as a very necessary and fundamental foundation to our full economic activity but is something that will act as a solid base for our leadership in the international field, because this is something which is of ever-increasing importance in most of the world. It is not so much in the field of our military leadership but our leadership in the development of underdeveloped areas which exist in much of the world, that the utilization of water ranks so high. It is one of the big problems facing the world. That is the type of thing that gives many of us concern.

We have felt that we should proceed with the further consideration of these projects that come up before the committee, so we will start this morning on public hearings on river and harbor projects in order that they will be followed by the larger flood control projects.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, you do not feel, do you, that the administration's reference to new starts is occasioned by the fact that the administration does not appreciate or recognize as the general does here this morning the need to go forward with these projects, do you?

You criticized the administration but you do not feel it is because they do not appreciate the fact that these needs exist that they have acted? The overriding issue of financing is what is bothering the administration, in view of the terrific call that has been made on our resources to meet the Soviet menace today. Is it not a question of relative values?

Mr. BLATNIK. That is exactly my point. It is a question of relative values. I say we will not be meeting the threat of the Soviet challenge to us in the worldwide view. We should be running on all cylinders and not just three out of four cylinders.

Mr. SCHERER. Of course we will be operating on all cylinders if our financial structure remains stable. Otherwise we cannot operated on all cylinders. That is the crux of it.

Mr. BLATNIK. Our financial structure will not remain stable with such a high percentage of our plant idle and with millions of men idle and resources unattended. As a society of free men and women, with this tremendous technical know-how and this enormous and fantastic capability to produce, we should be driving forward like a supercharged atomic submarine, plowing the oceans of the world and moving ahead in high gear.

Mr. MUMMA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. Yes.

Mr. MUMMA. The figures in the paper show it is going down considerably again. You know, at one time Truman said 5 million unemployed is no problem. We have it down to around three and a half or a little under.

Mr. SCHERER. And the percentage of unemployed is lower than during the Truman administration because the total employed is greater than ever.

Mr. MUMMA. Another thing, we go on the theory that expenditures would create this full employment.

Mr. BLATNIK. I am sorry, I didn't hear you.

Mr. MUMMA. You go under the theory that spending the money would encourage further employment.

Mr. BLATNIK. I prefer the reverse concept, that full productivity would give us the means, the taxes, for governmental resources to undertake these projects.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I am interested in this Hawaii project and I have another meeting. Could we go directly to that?

Mr. BLATNIK. We will proceed.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. I would like to ask unanimous consent that the gentlemen limit their remarks and let's get down to the meat.

Mr. BLATNIK. All right. We will now proceed.

General, again our heartiest thanks. We look forward to seeing you personally before we leave and we shall be calling on you of course also for further guidance in advising us in shaping up the current works projects now pending before this committee. We thank you, and with that go our very sincerest best wishes to you and to yours.

General PERSON. Thank you very much.

(Whereupon, the Committee on Public Works adjourned at 11:20 a.m.)

RIVER AND HARBOR AND FLOOD CONTROL OMNIBUS BILL, 1959

TUESDAY, MAY 12, 1959

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 11:20 a.m., in room 1302, New House Office Building, Hon. John A. Blatnik presiding.

PORT MANSFIELD, TEX.

Mr. BLATNIK. Our first project is a navigation project, Port Mansfield, Tex., and Lieutenant Colonel Parsons, Assistant Chief of Civil Works, will give us a description of these projects and the specifications and any engineering or physical aspects of the project.

We also have here our colleague and friend from Texas, Mr. Joe Kilgore, who will follow, and he has a witness from his district, who will testify on behalf of the project.

Colonel Parsons, would you please proceed.

STATEMENT OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL L. A. PARSONS, ASSISTANT CHIEF OF CIVIL WORKS, OFFICE, CHIEF OF ENGINEERS

Lieutenant Colonel PARSONS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The favorable report of the Chief of Engineers on the Port Mansfield channel and harbor study was submitted in compliance with several resolutions of the House and Senate Public Works Committees, the latest of which was adopted September 29, 1953.

Port Mansfield is on the southern coast of Texas about 93 miles south of Corpus Christi, and 38 miles north of Port Isabel. The mainland at this point is separated from the Gulf of Mexico by Laguna Madre and Padre Island. The Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, 125 feet wide and 12 feet deep, passes about 1½ miles from Port Mansfield, and there is an authorized and constructed Federal channel 12 feet by 125 feet leading to a turning basin at Port Mansfield.

The largest city in the vicinity is Raymondville, with a 1950 population of about 10,000. The commercial tributary area includes about 4,200 square miles with a population of 108,000 in 1950.

The area is primarily agricultural, with cotton, citrus fruits, and vegetables produced on irrigated lands and grazing on unirrigated lands. There are six producing oilfields within 35 miles of the port. Commercial and sport fishing in Laguna Madre, and both fishing and shrimping in the gulf, are important to the area. However,

41995—59——2

the present access to the gulf is at Aransas Pass, 100 miles to the north, or Brazos-Santiago Pass, 40 miles to the south.

Present commerce through the port averages about 11,000 tons per year and consists mainly of seafoods, refined petroleum products, building materials, oilfield machinery, automobiles, foodstuff, and ice.

Expected increases in annual commerce resulting from the recommended channel through Padre Island to the gulf are 1,300 tons of seafoods and 12,000 tons of fresh fruits. There will probably be increased traffic due to offshore oil drilling, but this is too indefinite for evaluation.

Local interests have made extensive improvements to the Federal project. They have constructed an outlet channel 100 feet by 10 feet to the gulf, with entrance jetties of tetrapods. In addition, they have extended the turning basin and added a shrimp-boat basin and a small-boat basin, all to a depth of 10 feet, except the small-boat basin, which is 8 feet. The cost of locally constructed navigation improvements is approximately $1.6 million.

In addition, the Willacy County Navigation District has invested approximately $1.1 million to provide excellent terminal facilities, consisting of wharves, 12,800 square feet of covered warehouse, moorings and pile stalls, shrimp and fish wharves and icing facilities, marine ways, fueling, water, electric and firefighting systems. All of these except the icing facilities will probably be adequate to care for prospective increased commerce.

Subsequent to the local construction, a storm destroyed the jetties and caused considerable shoaling of the entrance channel.

Local interests requested the district engineer to assume Federal maintenance of their construction and to investigate various combinations of widths and depths of channels, including enlargement to accommodate deep-draft vessels. The district engineer found that the reasonably prospective increase in traffic justified dredging the main channels and turning basin to a depth of 14 feet, but that greater depths were not justified.

The Chief of Engineers recommends modification of the existing project to provide for:

(*a*) Parallel stone jetties at the entrance channel, 2,300 feet and 2,190 feet long on the north and south, respectively.

(*b*) An entrance channel 16 feet deep and 250 feet wide to Padre Island, thence 14 feet deep and 100 feet wide to the GIWW, with two turnout curves at the waterway 12 feet deep and 125 feet wide.

(*c*) Thence 14 feet deep and 125 feet wide to the present turning basin, with the entrance curve to the turning basin widened to 200 feet, and with two turnout curves at the west side of the GIWW 12 feet deep and 200 feet wide.

(*d*) A turning basin 14 feet deep and 400 feet wide for a length of 1,200 feet, with an irregular extension having a maximum width of 1,000 feet.

(*e*) A shrimp boat basin 12 feet deep, 350 feet wide, and 1,450 feet long.

(*f*) A small-craft basin 8 feet deep, 160 feet wide, and 800 feet long. The first cost to the United States is estimated to be $3,431,000, and $165,000 annually for maintenance.

Local interests would be required to—

(*a*) Furnish free of cost to the United States all lands, easements, rights-of-way, and spoil disposal areas for the construction and maintenance.

(*b*) Hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction and maintenance.

(*c*) Furnish adequate terminal facilities for handling and icing seafoods, open to all on equal terms.

The United States will not dredge within 50 feet of any wharf or structure except in the small-boat basin where the limit shall be 30 feet.

Average annual benefits are estimated at $316,000, based on net increased seafood catch, savings in transportation costs from the gulf, and reduced navigation hazards.

The average annual charges are $293,000, including maintenance.

The benefit-cost ratio is 1.1 to 1.

The Governor of Texas concurs in the recommendations. The Department of Interior requested consideration of fish passages in the spoil placement, which we shall do.

The Bureau of the Budget offered no objection to the submission of the report.

Mr. BLATNIK. Does the Corps of Engineers recommend the project?

Lieutenant Colonel PARSONS. Yes; we do.

Mr. BLATNIK. Any questions?

Mr. DAVIS. That cost benefit is dangerously close, is it not?

Mr. MACK. 1.1 to 1.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir, it just barely did get in. The Budget Bureau was kind.

Mr. MACK. There is no oil cargo that would be handled in the immediate future over this waterway, is there?

Lieutenant Colonel PARSONS. No, sir, there is some oil—there is traffic attributable to oil but no actual oil cargoes at present.

Mr. MACK. How would they handle oil with a depth of only 14 feet?

Lieutenant Colonel PARSONS. I think the oil is handled presently by pipeline or shipment to the adjacent port, Port Isabel to the south or Corpus Christi to the north.

Mr. MACK. Barges?

Lieutenant Colonel PARSONS. Not tankers, I know, not in the sense of oil tankers as we think of them now, deep-draft tankers, no, sir.

Mr. MACK. You spoke of a small-craft harbor. Is that used by pleasure or commercial boats?

Lieutenant Colonel PARSONS. That will be primarily pleasure boats. There is also a shrimp boat basin, where there will be the commercial fishing vessels.

Mr. MACK. In previous years the Army Engineers insisted upon local contributions, in the case where a facility was used by any large percentage of pleasure craft, either sports fishing or yachts. Why is it there is no local contribution on this particular project when part of it will be used by pleasure craft?

Lieutenant Colonel PARSONS. In this case the small-boat basin is already at its final dimensions, hence there will be only the maintenance dredging in the small-boat basin.

Mr. MACK. I thank you.

Mr. BLATNIK. Thank you very much, Colonel.
Congressman Kilgore.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOE M. KILGORE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF TEXAS; ACCOMPANIED BY CHARLES JOHNSON, PORT DIRECTOR, PORT MANSFIELD, TEX.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate the opportunity to come before this committee and discuss this project.

My name is Joe M. Kilgore.

Mr. MCFALL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer the former member of the committee his old seat beside me.

Mr. BLATNIK. He was a very hardworking member, if I may say.

Mr. KILGORE. May I say off the record——

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. KILGORE. In all seriousness, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Charles Johnson, who is the port director of Port Mansfield, and I, appreciate very much this opportunity to appear before the committee, and to give you any information which may be helpful with respect to the proposed project at Port Mansfield.

I think the detailed information given to the committee on behalf of the Corps of Engineers certainly has been sufficient for the basic elements of the project, and I would like to indulge upon the committee just long enough to point out two or three additional factors.

This facility initially had in it about $93,000 of Federal money. The Willacy County Navigation District, which is the district that opens the port, then developed a bond issue of about $2,800,000, with which they built what is essentially the port as it is seen now, along with the cut across the Laguna Madre and across Padre Island. Their situation would be, at this time, ordinarily good and they had anticipated it would be. However, when the port was dedicated in October 1957 there followed within the month of November 1957 a series of gulf storms, that went all through that winter and through the following January, February, and March of 1958. So the action of the storms and the waves breached their jetties and actually shoaled the mouth of the pass across Padre Island. So, for all practical purposes, the Willacy County Navigation District finds itself with a port but without any gulf entrance into it.

They further find themselves in the position of having virtually extended to the maximum their ability to raise money locally. They have a total bond base evaluation of about $12 million. And having issued something only a couple of hundred thousand dollars less than $3 million in bonds against it, they find they are not in a position to carry the project further.

I think the committee should perhaps see the pictures of the port as it was initially constructed, and then with the pass cut through Padre Island as it appears on the map [showing photographs]. Then after the gulf storms it is evident to see what happened to the entrance to the pass when the jetties were breached, and when the entrance to the pass was shoaled over.

That, essentially, I think, is the information, in addition to the report of the engineers, which I thought the committee would be interested in.

If there is any other information we can answer we would be glad to do so.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Johnson, you may proceed with any supplementary oral testimony you may have. Any documents or details or further information you want will be included in the record with your statement.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, we appreciate the opportunity of coming before the committee this early. I think the Corps of Engineers and Mr. Kilgore have explained the situation quite extensively. I do want to call attention to the fact that in 1950 the Federal project was completed and we voted $150,000 for the facilities. In 1953, as a result of oil development in the Laguna Madre, it was necessary to increase the size of the harbor a hundred percent. We did not come to Congress for the money, though it was a Federal project. We borrowed some more money and doubled the size of the harbor.

The unemployment situation being bad and the need being very urgent for a channel to the gulf, and in view of the fact that we had 22 oil companies endorsing this channel with the view of exploring oil and gas in the Gulf of Mexico, we proposed and the people voted a bond issue for an additional $2,500,000 and we built this beautiful harbor, which increased the facilities about 400 percent, 9,000 feet of docks, with a harbor for 200 boats, 10 or 11 barges, 85 yachts and oil exploration boats, plus about 100 commercial fishing boats, for both the bay and the gulf. We built a big marine way, tourist courts, hotels, complete water system, power, lights, and telephone, a beautiful harbor we think.

It is unfortunate that this storm had to happen. We looked at the situation and we hoped to get Federal maintenance as recommended by the Corps of Engineers. The project was ready for submission a year ago in January to the Congress, but unfortunately the storm had damaged the entrance and the corps rightly sent the project back for review of the extent of the damage. That is the reason we are so late coming in.

Besides, the community as a whole is in serious financial condition—and there are many, many local people who have invested their money in this project—we are now operating at a loss.

We respectfully request that the committee give us early approval of authorization as requested by the Corps of Engineers and our fine Congressman from Texas.

Mr. BLATNIK. Thank you, Mr. Johnson.

Mr. JOHNSON. We would like to introduce these pictures, if I may, for the benefit of the committee, which gives you a better picture of what I can say.

Mr. BLATNIK. We will keep those pictures in the project file.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Johnson, you mentioned several times the development of oil in that region. This channel wouldn't contribute at all to the movement of oil, would it?

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes, sir, it would contribute some.

It first will contribute to the development and the drilling for oil and gas in the Gulf of Mexico, where there is some very large structures. In fact all the major and independent oil companies have endorsed this project, with a view of wishing to explore it.

Mr. MACK. Your statement is that it would contribute to the movement of oil drilling machinery from the port to the offshore region, not contribute to the transportation of the oil itself, if discovered, would it?

Mr. JOHNSON. That would be the result of exploration. We are shipping oil at the present time by barges, to Corpus Christi and Texas City out of our port.

Mr. MACK. It is merely a barge shipment of oil, not tankers?

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes, sir, but the MacWood Corp. has built a hundred thousand dollars of oil facilities at our port. They are contemplating shipping oil into Mexico and other areas by shallow-draft boats, that draw about 12 or 14 feet of water.

Mr. MACK. I suppose I should ask the engineers this question. Do you know if this project is completed as recommended, whether or not it will eliminate the possibility of future storms causing the channel to be blocked as it has been by the storms you told us about?

Lieutenant Colonel PARSONS. Are you asking me?

We believe it will, sir. There is a different type of jetty construction than the local interests put in.

Mr. BLATNIK. Thank you very much, Congressman Kilgore and Mr. Johnson.

KAHULUI HARBOR, ISLAND OF MAUI, T.H. (H. DOC. 109, 86TH CONG.)

Mr. BLATNIK. The next project will be Kahului Harbor, in our new State of Hawaii.

Lieutenant Colonel PARSONS. The favorable report of the Chief of Engineers on the improvement of Kahului Harbor is on the island of Maui, in the Territory of Hawaii, and the report was made in response to a resolution of the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives, dated April 21, 1953, and is contained in House Document 109, 86th Congress.

The existing Kahului Harbor is the only deep-draft harbor on the island of Maui. It is on the northern corner of the island, about 94 miles southeast of Honolulu, and 125 miles northwest of the port of Hilo, which is on the big island of Hawaii. The population of the island of Maui, in 1956, was approximately 38,000. Principal industries are sugar and pineapple raising; commercial fishing, ranching and dairying, and truck farming also contribute to the economy.

In 1956, the commerce through the existing harbor was 700,000 tons of which about a hundred thousand was interisland barge traffic. There is no significant passenger traffic through the port since most passengers now travel by air. Public terminal facilities consist of two piers, a covered warehouse, a bulk sugar plant, pipelines for the transmission of molasses, ammonia, various petroleum products, and fresh water. Piers are served by both roads and a railroad.

The existing Federal project was authorized in 1927 and provides for two breakwaters averaging about a half mile in length, an entrance channel 600 feet wide, and a harbor basin about 2,000 feet long, with a maximum width of nearly 1,500 feet. The depth is 35 feet.

The improvement desired and recommended is the enlargement of the harbor by dredging an area 600 by 2,400 feet, to a depth of 35 feet, along the west side of the harbor. This would add significantly to the maneuvering area.

At present the prevailing northeast winds tend to set the slowly moving vessels over to the southwest corner of the harbor, thus causing groundings, accidents, and delays. This difficulty can be expected to increase with the use of larger vessels having a greater area exposed to the wind. During the period 1950 through 1957 there were 14 vessel delays, 5 accidents other than groundings, and 3 groundings.

The average annual benefit to navigation from the improvement is $126,900. In addition, 32 acres of new land will be created by the deposition of dredge spoil. This will add an average annual benefit of about $8,300. Thus the total benefits are $135,200. The total first cost is estimated at $944,500 Federal cost, and $205,500 non-Federal cost, for a total of $1,150,000. The average annual charges are estimated to be $47,200. Thus the benefit-cost ratio is 2.9 to 1. Local interests are required to contribute in cash 3.1 percent of the new work, presently estimated at $30,200, or if they provide an alternate spoil disposal site to contribute a percentage based on the land enhancement benefits plus any increased cost of spoil disposal, to provide without cost to the United States the land easements, rights-of-way, and spoil disposal areas required, to hold and save the United States from damages due to the construction and maintenance, to continue to provide terminal and transfer facilities and to accomplish without cost to the United States any alteration and maintenance of utilities.

The Territory of Hawaii, the Department of Interior, and Department of the Navy have all commented favorably on the report. In addition, the Navy has said that the harbor offered a great potential for the dispersal of ships during an emergency. The Bureau of the Budget had no objection to the submission of the report.

Mr. BLATNIK. Thank you, Colonel.

Any questions?

Mr. MACK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. Hull, and the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Kluczynski, and myself are among those on the Public Works Committee who inspected this project. Also, we held hearings on the project in the islands and talked to the local people. We were very much impressed by the fact that the local interests were willing to contribute more than one-fourth of the cost of this project. We were further impressed by the high benefit-cost ratio.

I think I can say, in behalf of all the members of the committee—I am sure Mr. Hull will agree with me—we were very much impressed and would recommend to the committee that it approve this project.

Mr. HULL. I will concur with the statement of my distinguished colleague, Mr. Mack, from Washington. As he said, our committee inspected this area and I see Mr. Becker here this morning. He was over there also.

Mr. DAVIS. I was in that harbor later and I appreciate the merit of this project. If any project is a meritorious one, this is it.

Mr. MACK. The cost-benefit ratio here is 2.9; that means $2.90 of benefits for every dollar spent. The 2.9 applies to both the local contribution and Federal contribution. It is a return of 4 to 1 on the Federal contribution.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Becker, do you have a comment?

STATEMENT OF HON. FRANK J. BECKER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, if I may, at this time, I just came from a hearing of my own committee, and I would like to make this observation.

When I come here I have a very warm and friendly feeling because of the 5 years I had the honor of serving on this committee, serving with the distinguished chairman, and others. I also recognize the fact that, had I remained on this committee, I would be sitting in Mr. Scherer's seat, where he is now, in third position on the committee.

However, in 1957, I had the opportunity as a member of this committee to go out to the Hawaiian Islands and to look over the many projects requested by the Territory of Hawaii. Among those projects was the Kahului Harbor on the Island of Maui.

One thing we must recognize, I think, particularly since 1958 when I went over as a member of the Committee on Armed Services on the way to the Far East, is the fact that we only have one real large harbor on those islands at a great military outpost, and that is Pearl Harbor. Today it is the only real big harbor, and I believe the time has come when we need more harbors and larger harbors in that area for a better dispersement of our fleet in times of necessity such as happened in 1941.

I put that in because of the realization I have come to in these past 2 years. However, in dealing with this particular harbor, we find that it has great assets to the economy of this particular island and the other islands. If we do not widen this channel, if we do not dredge this in order to permit larger ships, commercial ships, to enter this harbor and have a proper turning place without being blown by the prevailing winds from the south at all times, causing considerable damage—I know the figures have been put in the record here, but in 1957 there were huge damages to ships, dollar damages, and again this past winter. But, by increasing the width of the turning basin and deepening this channel in the harbor, it will not only save the damages, but will also permit the increased shipping that is necessary for the economy as well as provide a harbor for many of our naval ships that we may have to utilize at some time in the future.

I do not believe that the project in a dollar sense is a large one. I believe it is a small project when we consider some of the figures for the harbor in Hilo on the Island of Hawaii. There it is a tremendous project and I know the Army Engineers, up to the time of last year, had not arrived at a proper solution to that harbor. But in light of the difficulty on the Island of Hawaii and Hilo harbor, I believe that harbor now should be done as quickly as possible, and the project completed at the earliest possible moment.

Now I think you all know I have no personal interest any more than any member of this committee in this project or in seeing that harbor is properly widened, other than that it serves our entire national purpose.

I want to extend my appreciation to the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. Blatnik, and to the members for hearing me at this time. I can not emphasize too strongly that those of us who have been out there on one or more occasions witnessed the conditions in this particular harbor, and recommend fully, as we have before, that this

work be started and consummated at the earliest possible moment for the reasons I have already stated, both economic and military.

I think for the future of the islands and our national economy, as well as our national defense, our country will be well served.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BLATNIK. Thank you for your fine statement.

Next we have our fine colleague, Mr. Burns.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN A. BURNS, DELEGATE AT LARGE FROM THE STATE OF HAWAII, ACCOMPANIED BY C. H. BURNETT, JR., GENERAL MANAGER OF THE KAHULUI RAILROAD CO., MAUI, HAWAII

Mr. BURNS. Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, I am not going to impose unduly on you, with the hour drawing close for adjournment.

Mr. BLATNIK. Some of the points may not have been covered, Mr. Burns. We will include all your testimony in the record.

Mr. BURNS. With me I have Mr. Burnett, and I would like to ask permission to include our statements in the record.

Mr. BLATNIK. It is so ordered.

(The statement of Mr. Burns is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN A. BURNS ON THE KAHULUI HARBOR PROJECT

Mr. Chairman, as Hawaii's Delegate to the Congress, I have the privilege of appearing before you today to speak on behalf of the enlargement of the existing turning basin in Kahului Harbor.

The Kahului Harbor turning basin enlargement project, estimated to cost the United States $944,500, has been found to be feasible and economically justified by the U.S. Engineers, as authorized by the Congress. The completed report on the survey has been submitted to the Congress after being processed through the proper administrative channels.

Kahului Harbor is the only deep sea harbor of the island of Maui whose commerce is totally dependent upon water transportation. The only other available transportation is by air, which is manifestly unable to handle the approximately three-quarters of a million tons of cargo that does go through Kahului Harbor.

In addition, no passenger boat will presently dare to use Kahului Harbor for fear that they could never get out. The effect of this upon the economic life of the island of Maui is quite evident. This project, Mr. Chairman, has an element of emergency connected thereto. Though started in 1953, there has been a delay on the part of Hawaii in following through.

Allocations were made for priliminary studies in 1955 on the instigation of a visiting Congressman. In 1957, an allocation of $2,700 was made for continuing the investigation, making a total of $6,700 to that date.

In fiscal 1958 and 1959, sufficient funds were included by reason of the understanding wisdom and very real concern of the Congress for the good and welfare of the people of the island of Maui, whose population has been declining as a result of the failure of Maui's economy to develop properly.

There is no project, in my opinion, that is more important to Hawaii from the economic standpoint than the Kahului Harbor project. Its effect upon the present and future economy of Maui is not only evident, it is clearly of great importance in the contribution it can make to the overall economic health of all the islands. In view of the above, I sincerely believe that the project merits the favorable consideration of the committee. I respectfully urge the committee to approve the project.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, for this opportunity to appear before you to speak on behalf of a most worthy and needed project of tremendous importance to the people of the island of Maui.

Mr. BURNS. In connection with passenger vessels, no passenger boats or ships would presently put into this harbor, because they were

afraid they couldn't get out. So you do not have, as pointed out by the colonel, any passenger traffic by sea.

I would not go further unless there are some questions. I would want to say to the committee I appreciate the fact that in the 85th Congress so many Members were able to come and I regret that the other Members were not able to accept our invitation. I am certain that the State of Hawaii will renew that invitation to the committee to come out and look over our projects and our islands.

Mr. Burnett has a brief oral statement to give to you.

Mr. BURNETT. My name is C. H. Burnett, Jr., Mr. Chairman, general manager of the Kahului Railroad Co. on the island of Maui, T.H.

I am here to urge the enactment of the legislation that will bring about the improvements in this harbor.

Gentlemen, I had a prepared statement, but after what I have heard, it has all been covered and there is nothing I can say except thank you very much for allowing us to appear. I appreciate the support that I feel has been set forth in our behalf.

Mr. BLATNIK. Your project was highly recommended, and you may carry our message back to the folk you represent that we will give it most serious and favorable consideration.

(The oral statement and formal prepared statement are as follows:)

ORAL PRESENTATION OF C. H. BURNETT, JR.

I am C. H. Burnett, Jr., general manager of the Kahului Railroad Co. on the island of Maui, T.H.

I am here to urge the enactment at this session of Congress of appropriate legislation to authorize the enlargement of the turning basin in Kahului Harbor. A prepared statement and exhibits have been distributed to the committee showing the urgent need for this project.

The required surveys and reports have been completed, with favorable recommendations and the determination of a benefit-cost ratio of 2.9 to 1. These documents are before your committee in the form of House Document No. 109 which was submitted as Executive Communication 775 as shown on the legislative calendar of your committee.

This is the fifth trip from Hawaii that I have made to Washington on behalf of this Kahului Harbor project. I believe the members of this committee are familiar with our situation; some of you have been there.

The present turning basin, with an east-west width of 1,450 feet is inadequate to permit the larger size ships now regularly visiting the port to enter or leave safely under wind conditions usually prevailing. An additional tug has been placed in service, but even with this addition, some of the ships will not enter or leave the port in the windy weather which prevails much of the time.

The inadequacies of the present turning basin arise primarily because of the broadside exposure to the prevailing fresh easterly winds as lightly loaded ships enter with a sharp turn past the breakwater. There is insufficient leeway for the captain of a vessel to maneuver at the low speed necessary inside the harbor without the danger of being blown by the winds to the shallows at the west edge of the basin. The hazards of the narrow turning basin are further accentuated upon departure when vessels must back in a turn of almost 180° which brings them dangerously close to the shallows.

Serious accidents have occurred and costly delays are encountered. The risks are such that the present day oceangoing vessels threaten to bypass Kahului Harbor and Kahului is in danger of becoming a ghost port.

This also means the bypassing of the island of Maui.

Kahului is the only harbor on Maui available to accommodate oceangoing and interisland vessels.

The island of Maui has a high potential value for defense. This is most aptly put by the Commandant, 14th Naval District and commander, Hawaiian Sea Frontier, in his letter of April 3, 1958, to the Secretary of the Navy.

"* * * Kahului Harbor offers a high potential in harbors in the Territory of Hawaii for possible decentralization of Navy vessels of all types from congested

areas in the event of emergency. The island of Maui offers excellent and proved potential for training, operations, and dispersal of personnel and equipment."

The Chief of Naval Operations has recommended that the proposed enlargement "be accomplished at the earliest possible date."

The report of the district engineer refers to frequency of marine accidents and delays of vessels and states: "the existing hazardous conditions in Kahului Harbor will soon be intolerable."

The need for this improvement is immediate and urgent.

We urge that this harbor improvement deserves prompt authorization. The improvement is essential to the avoidance of serious accidents and costly delays; it is essential to the welfare of the business and the people of the island of Maui; and it will be a valuable contribution to national defense.

STATEMENT OF C. H. BURNETT, JR.

My name is C. H. Burnett, Jr. I am the general manager of the Kahului Railroad Co., located on the island of Maui, Territory of Hawaii.

The island of Maui is wholly dependent upon water transportation to carry on the commerce so necessary to maintain the economy and welfare of its population of over 37,600 persons. The only harbor on Maui available to accommodate oceangoing and interisland vessels engaged in such commerce is Kahului Harbor where cargo handled annually approximates 750,000 tons.

The project to which my statement and supporting brief are directed is the enlargement of the turning basin at Kahului Harbor, on the island of Maui, T.H. The required surveys and reports have been completed, with favorable recommendations and the determination of a benefit-cost ratio of 2.9 to 1.0. They were submitted to the 86th Congress by letter of transmittal from the Secretary of the Army dated March 27, 1959, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated February 18, 1959, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on Kahului Harbor, island of Maui, T.H., requested by resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted April 21, 1953. They are embodied in House Document No. 109, 86th Congress, which, on April 7, 1959, was referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed.

As supporting evidence I submit a group of exhibits which will be listed at the close of this statement. The first exhibit is an aerial photograph of the harbor; and the last (so placed for convenience in folding) is a reproduction of a map of the harbor. An inspection of these exhibits will permit a ready visualization of the nature of the improvement sought.

All that portion of the harbor beyond the opening between the breakwaters, on the westerly and southerly side (the side opposite the piers and wharves) is presently so shallow as to be unnavigable. It is proposed to extend the navigable portion of the harbor (now a maximum of 1,450 feet east-west in width) by 600 feet, by dredging an area approximately 600 feet wide and 2,400 feet long to a depth of 35 feet. This will give a turning basin of 2,100 feet in width instead of 1,450, as at present.

The present size of the turning basin is inadequate to accommodate ships of the size that now regularly visit the port, sizes considerably greater than those prevailing at the time of the last enlargement of the turning basin in 1931. The inadequacies of the present harbor turning basin arise primarily because of insufficient east-west width, bearing in mind the prevailing fresh easterly winds and the broadside exposure of lightly loaded ships to those winds as they turn sharply past the breakwater into the harbor. There is insufficient leeway for the captain of a vessel to maneuver at the low speeds necessary inside the harbor without the danger of being blown by the winds to the shallows at the west edge of the basin. The hazards of the narrow turning basin are even further accentuated upon departure when vessels must back in a turn of almost 180° which brings them dangerously close to the shallows.

The need for this improvement is immediate and urgent. It is our fervent hope that both an authorization in a public works act and an appropriation may be enacted at the present session of Congress.

A graphic example of the serious dangers that prevail under the present conditions in Kahului Harbor was unfortunately supplied on December 23, 1957. On that day the C–3 vessel, the SS *Hawaiian Fisherman*, belonging to the

Matson Navigation Co., was grounded while trying to leave our harbor. In the exhibits attached, exhibit No. 2 are pictures of this ship wallowing in the shallow waters of our harbor which presents a solemn warning for the future.

Your attention is called particularly to the letter set forth as exhibit No. 3, dated March 6, 1958, from Randolph Sevier, president, Matson Navigation Co., to Kahului Railroad Co. The inadequacy of the present Kahului Harbor turning basin has caused loss and damage to this single company alone, from grounding and collision, of approximately $440,000, entirely apart from costly schedule delays likewise caused by the presently inadequate turning basin.

As further evidence with respect to grounding which have occurred because of the inadequacy of the present turning basin, I quote from the engineer's report (part of H. Doc. No. 109) as follows:

"54. *Groundings.*—During the 8-year period of 1950–57, three groundings occurred in Kahului Harbor. An account of each of the groundings is presented in appendix B. Following is a tabulation of data on the groundings:

"Vessel groundings, 1950–57

Ship	Date	Total estimated cost
Hawaiian Wholesaler	Feb. 21, 1950	$461,400
Hawaiian Lumberman	July 31, 1951	500
Hawaiian Fisherman	Dec. 31, 1957	425,000
Total		886,900
Average annual (1950–57)		110,900"

Other marine accidents have occurred which have caused damage to shore facilities and in one case to a U.S. Coast Guard buoy.

In addition to the direct losses caused by such groundings and other marine accidents, the economic loss of delays attributable to this presently inadequate Kahului Harbor turning basin must be taken into consideration. Because of the restricted dimensions of the turning basin, ships must often wait for better weather and light conditions before attempting the dangerous task of entering or leaving the harbor. These delays necessarily lead to increased shipping costs, threaten the bypassing of the island of Maui by the ever-larger vessels, and will ultimately undermine and destroy the strength of our island.

Additional data on delays which have occurred during the year that has intervened since our last appearance in Washington in support of this project are attached as exhibit No. 4.

The navigable portion of the harbor was designed originally for vessels of smaller size than those now in general service. Since 1931 there has been no widening of the turning basin to adequately accommodate the increasing size of ships calling at the port. With one exception vessels using the harbor pre-World-War II averaged 56 feet in beam and ranged from 324 to 424 feet in length. Present vessels serving Kahului in the main are of the C–3 design, measuring 468.5 feet in length with 69.5 foot beam. Another class of ship, the *Mariner*, measuring 563 feet in length with 76-foot beam, also calls at Kahului. Compared with pre-World-War II days, this would indicate a gain of 100 feet in ship length and between 13.5 and 20 feet in beam for present-day vessels. Further detailed comparisons are contained in exhibit No. 5 attached.

Freight tonnage moving through Kahului has increased by nearly 15 percent since 1951 to a total of 766,483 short tons in 1957 without significant gain in the number of vessels calling at the port. This clearly reflects the trend toward larger ships. These figures also reflect the rate of tonnage increase which can be expected to continue with improvement of the harbor.

This trend toward bigger ships has come from the search for economical operation. It is, therefore, not unreasonable to anticipate that in the not distant future even larger ships will be calling at Kahului regularly and the harbor must be prepared to handle them or face the possibility of being bypassed or stifled.

The existence of these conditions has in the past and will even more in the future cause ships to bypass Kahului Harbor. This in effect means bypassing the island of Maui. Kahului is the only harbor on the island which can accommodate ocean ship traffic. Kahului is being forced into the category of a fair-weather port now and faces the possibility of becoming a ghost port in

the future as far as oceangoing vessels are concerned. Such a trend imperils the existence of the many transportation workers, dockworkers and longshoremen who are directly and adversely affected by any decline in tonnage moving through Kahului Harbor.

Such a trend is also a threat to the entire economy of the island of Maui, an area of 728 square miles with a population of 37,600 inhabitants. The island is almost wholly dependent upon ocean transportation to carry on the commerce which is necessary to maintain its economy. Principal exports to the U.S. mainland are pineapple and sugar. The mainland is the principal source for Maui's imports which include a cross section of consumer goods and the many items required for agricultural production on the island.

Kahului Harbor is the only harbor available on Maui for the accommodation of overseas vessels engaged in ocean commerce and the interisland vessels which support the trade between the islands of Hawaii. In 1957 this harbor handled over 766,000 tons of cargo valued in excess of $112 million. Freight tonnage moving through the harbor has increased almost 15 percent since 1951. The number of vessels calling at the port during the years 1951–57 are tabulated below:

Number of vessels calling at Kahului Harbor

	Overseas freighters and tankers	Interisland barges		Overseas freighters and tankers	Interisland barges
1951	179	159	1955	195	203
1952	168	165	1956	194	166
1953	170	174	1957	205	175
1954	182	202	1958		

Further statistical details are shown by attached exhibits 6 and 7.

Kahului Harbor is an existing port. As shown in our exhibits 8 and 9, many millions of dollars have been spent in harbor improvements, shore and docking intallations, and transportation facilities to make it what it is today. Enlargement of the basin is absolutely necessary to preserve all this.

During World War II the 4th Marine Division was based upon Maui, and the harbor was used significantly. However, with the trend to larger vessels, the utility of this harbor to the Armed Forces in the event of emergency is drastically reduced.

Attention is called to letter, dated April 3, 1958, to the Secretary of the Navy from commandant, 14th Naval District, and commander, Hawaiian Sea Frontier, recommending endorsement of this project. From that letter, I quote the following:

"2. Inasmuch as subject harbor is the only deep seaport on the Island of Maui and the turning basin has not been enlarged since 1931 to accommodate the increased size of commercial vessels, numerous schedule delays and three groundings have occurred which were directly attributable to prevailing high winds and limitations of the turning basin.

* * * * * * *

"3. It is the considered opinion of the commandant, 14th Naval District, and commander, Hawaiian Sea Frontier, that Kahului Harbor offers a high potential in harbors in the Territory of Hawaii for possible decentralization of Navy vessels of all types from congested areas in the event of emergency. The island of Maui offers excellent and proved potential for training, operations, and dispersal of personnel and equipment."

The comments of the Department of the Navy, part of House Document No. 109, included a letter dated February 2, 1959, from the Chief of Naval Operations. From that letter the following paragraphs are quoted:

"2. The following operational information is pertinent:

"(*a*) The subject harbor is the only deep seaport on the island of Maui.

"(*b*) The turning basin has not been enlarged since 1931 to accommodate increased ship sizes; this has resulted in numerous delays in ship schedules. Three groundings by commercial ships have been directly attributable to prevailing high winds and limitations of the turning basin.

"(*c*) The subject harbor offers a high potential in the Hawaiian area for possible dispersal of all types of Navy ships in the event of an emergency. The island of Maui further offers excellent and proven potential for training operations and dispersal of personnel and equipment.

"3. The Chief of Naval Operations recommends that the proposed dredging of Kahului Harbor be accomplished at the earliest possible date in order to alleviate the existing navigational hazards and provide a greatly improved port facility.

"4. The review report and attendant papers mentioned in the basic correspondence have been retained."

We earnestly join in the recommendation of the Chief of Naval Operations that the proposed improvement be accomplished "at the earliest possible date."

The economic needs of the island of Maui and the considerations relating to national defense previously referred to, both require early completion of this project.

Among other findings of the district engineer (H. Doc. 109) is the following:

"Although the frequency of marine accidents and delays of vessels is serious with the present volume of commerce and size of ships in service, the immediate prospect of larger ships being used and the steady growth of waterborne commerce, the existing hazardous conditions in Kahului Harbor will soon be intolerable."

The first cost is estimated at $975,000 of which local interests are expected to provide 3.1 percent. Accordingly, an appropriation of $945,000 will permit the completion of the improvement. Attached as exhibit No. 10 are extracts from the district engineer's report relating to costs and other estimates.

This improvement of Kahului Harbor has, among others, the highest endorsement of (1) the Affiliated Chambers of Commerce of the Territory of Hawaii; (2) the Board of Harbor Commissioners, Territory of Hawaii; (3) the United States Propellor Club, Port of Honolulu, Honolulu, Hawaii; (4) the Board of Supervisors, County of Maui; and (5) the Maui Chamber of Commerce.

The citizens of Maui and the Territory of Hawaii earnestly seek your support, just as you have extended it to us in the past. With the appropriation of the necessary funds, this grave emergency confronting Maui and the Territory of Hawaii can be met.

Thank you for your consideration in the past and for the future.

TABLE OF EXHIBITS

1. Aerial photograph of Kahului Harbor.
2. Pictures of the grounding of the C–3 vessel SS *Hawaiian Fisherman* (Matson Navigation Co.) while outbound from Kahului Harbor December 23, 1957.
3. Letter dated March 6, 1958, from Randolph Sevier, president, Matson Navigation Co., San Francisco, Calif.
4. Damage and delays occurring to shipping in Kahului Harbor, April 1958 to April 1959.
5. Representative types of ships calling at Kahului Harbor.
6. Tonnage and value of cargo moving in and out of Kahului Harbor, 1951–58.
7. Statistical data of Maui business, 1954.
8. The development of Kahului Harbor.
9. Capital improvements to Kahului Harbor with funds provided by the Territory of Hawaii.
10. Extracts from district engineer's report, May 30, 1958.
11. Detailed map of Kahului Harbor.

(These exhibits can be found in committee files.)

COTUIT HARBOR, MASS.

Mr. BLATNIK. We have one more navigation project.

This is Cotuit Harbor, in Massachusetts. Colonel Smith, Corps of Engineers, will give us the information on this harbor.

STATEMENT OF COL. STEPHEN E. SMITH, ASSISTANT CHIEF OF CIVIL WORKS, CORPS OF ENGINEERS, U.S. ARMY

Colonel SMITH. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, the report on Cotuit Harbor is in response to a resolution of this committee adopted January 28, 1947. The report was submitted to Congress by the Secretary of the Army on May 8, 1959.

Cotuit Harbor is on the south shore of Cape Cod, about 27 miles east of New Bedford, Mass. It consists of three interconnected well-protected bays that are extensively used for recreational boating, Cotuit Bay, West Bay, and Great Bay. The local fleet includes 542 craft; in addition numerous transient craft make use of the harbor. Commercial traffic in the harbor is negligible. The controlling depths in the present channels vary from 5 to 8 feet. Numerous public and private docking facilities are available. There is no Federal project in the area at this time.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts has maintained channels in these bays and has constructed the West Bay entrance into Nantucket Sound, protected by jetties. They have attempted, without success, to maintain an entrance channel from Nantucket Sound directly into Cotuit Bay. It shoals up to about 3 feet in a very short time. Local interests desire that the Federal Government provide channels 12 feet deep from Nantucket Sound, through the West Bay entrance, from West Bay and Great Bay and through the narrows and from Cotuit Bay through the Seapuit River.

The Chief of Engineers recommends a channel 10 feet deep from Nantucket Sound, through the West Bay entrance, then 8 feet deep through West Bay into Great Bay, and an 8-foot channel in the Seapuit River, into Cotuit Bay.

The estimated cost of this project is $670,000. The Federal cost is estimated at $335,000 for construction, and $29,200 annually for maintenance. Annual charges are $54,800, and annual benefits $61,210, giving a benefit-cost ratio of 1.1 to 1.

Local interests are required to contribute in cash 50 percent of the cost of construction, presently estimated at $335,000, provide all lands, easements, rights-of-way, and and spoil-disposal areas; hold and save the United States free from damages; provide and maintain suitable public landings and maintain the existing jetties at the entrance to West Bay.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts favors the project and has provided reasonable assurances that they will meet the necessary requirements for local cooperation. The Department of the Interior and Bureau of the Budget have no objection to the project.

That concludes my statement, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BLATNIK. Thank you, Colonel.

Is Mr. Keith here?

(No response.)

Mr. BLATNIK. Any other witnesses on this project?

(No response.)

Mr. BLATNIK. Any questions?

Mr. SCHERER. Colonel, I notice the benefit-cost ratio is again very close. We all know these projects eventually cost more than originally estimated. Do you think we are going to be able to maintain that benefit-to-cost ratio?

Colonel SMITH. We have just adjusted the estimated cost to January 1959 construction figures, so it is up to date.

Mr. SCHERER. But it has been our experience, as I indicated, that all of these projects, before they are eventually completed, cost a great deal more than originally estimated. I am wondering whether or not we would be able to maintain this benefit-cost ratio, knowing the project will eventually cost more than is now estimated.

Colonel SMITH. We think so. This is entirely a recreation project and we have been very conservative in estimating the benefit.

Mr. SCHERER. Thank you.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question.

Did I understand you to say the annual maintenance cost would be $29,200 a year?

Colonel SMITH. Yes, sir.

Mr. JOHNSON. Borne by the Federal Government?

Colonel SMITH. That is correct.

Mr. BLATNIK. Thank you, Colonel Smith.

Since the four minor bills are not going to take much time, shall we proceed now and dispose of them; the House will be in session at noon.

I think we can dispose of these in 10 or 15 minutes.

You will find your sheet entitled "Bills for Consideration by Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors." Skip the first one of several authors, change the name of a lock and dam in Columbia, Ala. This was put on inadvertently.

Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. BLATNIK. We will start with H.R. 1074 by Mr. Williams, to repeal the act creating the Louisiana-Vicksburg Bridge Commission.

(The bill is as follows:)

[H.R. 1074, 86th Cong., 1st sess.]

A BILL To repeal the Act of August 9, 1939, creating the Louisiana-Vicksburg Bridge Commission

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act entitled "An Act creating the Louisiana-Vicksburg Bridge Commission; defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission; and authorizing said commission and its successors and assigns to purchase, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Delta Point, Louisiana, and Vicksburg, Mississippi", approved August 9, 1939 (53 Stat. 1267), is hereby repealed.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Frank Heller, of the Corps of Engineers, will you give us a quick description and explanation of what the bill does?

STATEMENT OF FRANK HELLER, CORPS OF ENGINEERS, U.S. ARMY

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of H.R. 1074 is to repeal the act of August 9, 1939, creating the Louisiana-Vicksburg Bridge Commission. That act also authorized this Interstate Commission to purchase, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River, at or near Delta Point, La., and Vicksburg, Miss. The bridge at this location was constructed in 1930 by the Vicksburg Bridge & Terminal Co.

Our records show that the ownership of this bridge was transferred to the Board of Supervisors of Warren County, Miss., subsequent to the enactment of the 1939 act. It was actually transferred the 30th of April 1947.

Since the bridge is now operated by a public agency, there appears to be no need for the act of 1939. Therefore, the Chief of Engineers has no objection to the enactment of H.R. 1074.

I should mention, however, that the Secretary of the Army has not submitted a report on this bill.

Mr. BLATNIK. And the Commerce Department submitted a report indicating no objection to the bill; is that correct?

Mr. HELLER. That is my understanding, sir.

Mr. BLATNIK. Is there any Federal cost involved?

Mr. HELLER. There is no Federal cost.

Mr. BLATNIK. There is no need for legislation creating this Commission then; is that correct?

Mr. HELLER. There is apparently no need to continue the authorization of 1939 that created the Commission, from our knowledge.

Mr. BLATNIK. Any questions?

(No response.)

Mr. BLATNIK. Thank you very much.

Next is H.R. 2191 by Mr. Clem Miller, of California, designating the Petaluma Creek in California as Petaluma River.

(The bill is as follows:)

[H.R. 2191, 86th Cong., 1st sess.]

A BILL To designate a stream in California as the "Petaluma River"

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the body of water in California now designated and referred to as "Petaluma Creek" shall hereafter be known and designated as "Petaluma River". Any law, regulation, document, or record of the United States in which such body of water is designated or referred to by the name of "Petaluma Creek" shall be held and considered to refer to such body of water as "Petaluma River".

Mr. BLATNIK. Colonel Parsons, could you give us a brief explanation of H.R. 2191?

STATEMENT OF LT. COL. L. A. PARSONS—Resumed

Lieutenant Colonel PARSONS. This is the change of a name of Petaluma Creek to Petaluma River, sir. It has no bearing on any Corps of Engineers project. The Department of the Army and Corps of Engineers have no objection to the legislation. The Bureau of the Budget also advises there was no objection to the submission of the report saying we had no objection.

Mr. BLATNIK. There is no Federal cost or future obligation involved?

Lieutenant Colonel PARSONS. It involves no Federal costs or obligations.

Mr. SCHERER. Why do they want it changed, as a matter of convenience?

Lieutenant Colonel PARSONS. I have no idea, sir.

Mr. BLATNIK. Thank you very much.

Next, by Mr. Perkins, H.R. 5515. And the bill of Mr. Hechler, H.R. 5502. To amend Public Law 996, 84th Congress, disposal of federally owned property at obsolescent canalized waterways to increase authorization relating to dam No. 3 on Big Sandy River, Ky.

(The bill is as follows:)

[H.R. 5515, 86th Cong., 1st sess.]

A BILL To amend the 1956 Act authorizing the disposal of certain obsolete locks and dams on the Big Sandy River, Kentucky-West Virginia, for the purpose of increasing the authorization relating to dam numbered 3 on the Big Sandy River, Kentucky

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the disposal of federally owned property at obsolescent canalized waterways and for other purposes", approved August 6, 1956 (70 Stat. 1062), is amended by striking out "$50,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$100,000".

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Frank Heller, will you give us the details on this bill?

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of these bills, which are identical in language, is to amend section 2 of the act approved August 6, 1956, to increase the statutory limit of Federal expenditure for restoration of dam No. 3 on the Big Sandy River.

Mr. SCHERER. I didn't understand that.

Mr. BLATNIK. Dam No. 3.

Mr. SCHERER. Repeat what you said, will you please?

Mr. HELLER. The purpose of these bills is to increase the statutory limit of Federal expenditure for restoring dam No. 3 on the Big Sandy River. Section 2 of the 1956 act authorized expenditures, not to exceed $50,000, for restoration and modification of this lock and dam. This was contingent on local interest furnishing such additional funds as may be necessary and agreeing to accept the property and take over the maintenance of the restored structure. These bills would amend the 1956 act by increasing the amount authorized from $50,000 to $100,000. In this connection, the act of Congress approved September 4, 1957, authorized not to exceed $112,500 for restoring the little Kanawha River lock and dam No. 3, West Virginia, subject to similar conditions of local participation.

Inasmuch as the Congress has authorized a comparable dam restoration essentially at Federal expenditure, the Department of Army interposes no objection to the enactment of these bills. I should mention, however, that it is not known whether or not this legislation conforms to the program of the President. As soon as we receive the advice of the Bureau of the Budget, it will be furnished to the committee.

Mr. BLATNIK. There is no Bureau of Budget report that has been submitted yet?

Mr. HELLER. No, sir.

Mr. BLATNIK. What are the annual charges to the Government, to maintain this obsolescent dam No. 3? Is there any annual costs?

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Chairman, not in its present condition does it cost the Federal Government to maintain it. The dam is a wicket type and the wickets have been removed, but there would be a cost if we proceeded to abandon it and not restore it. The cost then would be about $34,000 to modify it so as to restore the natural drainage in this section of the river.

Mr. SCHERER. That would be the final cost of it?

Mr. HELLER. That is correct, the final cost to finally abandon the structure.

Mr. SCHERER. There wouldn't be any annual charge then?

Mr. HELLER. Not after that, sir.

Mr. WITHROW. What is the purpose of restoring it?

Mr. HELLER. The purpose of restoring it is for local water supply. The original pool of dam No. 3, which was established back in 1897 for navigation, also provided a source of water supply for local interests in that area.

Water treatment plants at both Louisa, Ky. and Port Gay, W. Va., were constructed some time ago when the pool was in existence and it is understood that difficulty has arisen since the loss of the pool in providing a dependable supply.

Mr. SCHERER. I remember that was before us.

Mr. BLATNIK. That was a dam in West Virginia, if I recall.

Mr. SCHERER. This is not the same one, but it is the same problem.

Mr. BLATNIK. Yes. I am not quite clear yet what would be the saving to the Federal Government. On what grounds does the corps recommend this bill.

Mr. HELLER. Actually, Mr. Chairman, there would be no actual savings to the Federal Government. There would be a great benefit, though, to the local communities to have this dam restored.

Mr. BLATNIK. Do you mean that we have no use for it, and the sooner we get rid of it, dispose of the facilities, the better it would be?

Mr. HELLER. That is correct.

Mr. SCHERER. What has caused the increase from the original authorization of $50,000, which is now $100,000?

Mr. HELLER. The original $50,000 was based upon restoring this dam by putting back the wickets, and making it again a movable dam.

Mr. SCHERER. Is that what the local community asked for at the time the legislation was passed in 1956?

Mr. HELLER. I believe that is what local interests felt should be done, just restore the wickets, but we have made detailed investigation of conditions since the enactment of the prior act and it is found now that it would be advisable to make this a fixed dam. That would avoid considerable maintenance cost, after it is reconstructed, because if we restored it as a movable dam, it would require floating plant to operate and maintain it.

Mr. SCHERER. What will be the local contribution under the increased authorization?

Mr. HELLER. Our estimate of the actual cost of restoring it as a fixed dam is $90,000, which is some $10,000 less than this new limit of $100,000. However, the actual cost would only be determined after we advertised the work and got the contract bid prices on it.

Mr. SCHERER. There is no local contribution then?

Mr. HELLER. There could be local contribution. If it costs more than $100,000, under the provisions——

Mr. SCHERER. But your estimated cost now is $90,000, and you propose an authorization of $100,000?

Mr. HELLER. Of course the big advantage here is that by local interests taking it over, the Federal Government will be relieved of all future responsibility for the structure, and any damage that might possibly be caused by the existence of it.

Mr. SCHERER. You said the total cost to the Federal Government though would be about $34,000 to get rid of it altogether?

Mr. HELLER. That is correct.

Mr. SCHERER. So this is solely, this authorization would be solely for the advantage of the local community, would it not?

Mr. HELLER. It would be advantageous to the local communities, and the economy of the area.

Mr. SCHERER. No advantage to the Federal Government?

Mr. HELLER. Not directly, sir.

Mr. SCHERER. So it is a gift of approximately $66,000, to the local community, is it not?

Mr. HELLER. It would be to their advantage. Yes, sir.

Mr. SCHERER. So far the local community has agreed to contribute nothing to this project, has it?

Mr. HELLER. There is a pending agreement with the local communities to accept this structure.

Mr. SCHERER. I understand, but they are not to pay any of this $100,000 cost?

Mr. HELLER. Not if the cost of restoration is less than $100,000, sir.

Mr. SCHERER. The Army recommends this under those conditions?

Mr. HELLER. We have no objection to this, because the Congress had authorized a previous and similar dam restoration.

Mr. SCHERER. That is the one in West Virginia you are referring to?

Mr. HELLER. Yes, sir; Little Kanawa River lock and dam No. 3.

Mr. SCHERER. We created a precedent. I thought we would.

Mr. BLATNIK. Well, the local community will then be—they have agreed, have they, to provide for proper maintenance?

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Chairman, the agreement has been drafted but has not yet been executed pending action on legislation to amend the previous authorization.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Chairman, I think for purposes of clarity, these locks lie in the Big Sandy River, between Fort Gay, W. Va., and Louisa, Ky., do they not, and in the previous status of this dam, it caused sufficient pool that Fort Gay and Louisa both had an adequate water supply.

When it was decided to dispose of these, in connection with the project that you mentioned and the gentleman from Ohio mentioned, it was simply roughly estimated that $50,000 would put these locks, when abandoned, in position that Fort Gay and Louisa would still have their water supply, but upon study it became obvious that $50,000 would not do it.

Isn't that really the reason these bills are here, that the cost of achieving the desired end was underestimated?

Mr. HELLER. In effect, that is correct, sir. It was underestimated from the standpoint that we have a somewhat different plan of restoration that would avoid unnecessary maintenance cost in the future.

Mr. BURKE. And isn't it true that both of these towns have a very serious water supply problem by virtue of the fact that the necessary abandonment of the locks has come up?

Mr. HELLER. Yes, sir; it is our understanding they are having a problem meeting their water supply requirements without restoration of this dam.

Mr. BLATNIK. Any further questions?

(No response.)

Thank you, Mr. Heller.

We will now hear from Representative Carl D. Perkins, of Kentucky, on this bill.

STATEMENT OF HON. CARL D. PERKINS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF KENTUCKY

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I am vitally concerned about an adequate water supply for the cities of Louisa, Ky., and across the river, Fort Gay, W. Va.

In making disposition of certain obsolete locks and dams in 1956, the Congress provided an authorization of $50,000 for the purpose of repairing lock and dam No. 3 on the Big Sandy River in order to insure an adequate water supply for the cities of Louisa and Fort Gay.

In view of the high cost of materials, the Army engineers now estimate that it will cost approximately $100,000 to make the necessary repairs in order to insure this adequate water supply.

Some time ago I introduced H.R. 5515 which merely increases the authorization from $50,000 to $100,000 by amending the 1956 act. It is necessary that these repairs be made at the earliest possible date, and I sincerely urge the members of this committee to approve H.R. 5515, or else incorporate H.R. 5515 in your omnibus rivers and harbors bill which you are now considering.

I do appreciate the opportunity to appear before you, and sincerely hope that you will immediately approve this increased authorization.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BLATNIK. The last bill, H.R. 802, Mr. Horan of Washington, to validate and confirm a contract entered into between the United States and the town of Bridgeport, Wash. (Chief Joseph Dam project.)

(The bill is as follows:)

[H.R. 802, 86th Cong., 1st sess.]

A BILL To validate and confirm a contract entered into between the United States and the town of Bridgeport, Washington

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the contract numbered DA–45–108–ENG–565, entered into on June 15, 1950, between the town of Bridgeport, Washington, and the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, on behalf of the United States, in which the United States agreed to pay for certain municipal services furnished by the town of Bridgeport, Washington, is hereby validated and confirmed as of June 15, 1950.

Mr. BLATNIK. Colonel Vivian, will you give us an explanation of this legislation?

STATEMENT OF LT. COL. JAMES A. VIVIAN, U.S. ARMY, CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Colonel VIVIAN. Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman, the Department's views favoring the proposed legislation are contained in a letter dated the 29th of April 1959, which has been delivered to the committee. The Bureau of the Budget has advised that it does not favor the enactment of this legislation. The problem which H.R. 802 seeks to cure is that

the Comptroller General has declared invalid a contract for the provision of certain services between the Government and the city of Bridgeport, Wash., thereby forcing the Corps of Engineers to seek reimbursement of $14,440, already paid to the city.

The Comptroller General's letter which was forwarded with the Department's comments, states that the contract would have the effect of nullifying the Government's tax-exempt status, since the annual payment is equivalent to a payment in lieu of taxes. Payment to the city was equal to the amount paid as taxes by other citizens in the town.

In reliance upon the contract, the town purchased equipment and hired full-time police and a professional fireman. The annual payment by the Government is less than the salary of one man. If the decision of the Comptroller General stands, a grave injustice will result to the citizens of Bridgeport.

Mr. SCHERER. How much is involved?

Colonel VIVIAN. The annual payment is $2,280 per year.

This contract has run since the 15th of June 1950.

Mr. BLATNIK. What is the total amount?

Colonel VIVIAN. We have already paid the city of Bridgeport an amount of over $14,000, sir, and now we have to seek reimbursement because of this Comptroller General decision.

Mr. SCHERER. And the bill cancels the obligation?

Colonel VIVIAN. The bill would validate the contract so we could go ahead—we would not have to seek reimbursement and we could continue under the contract until, to answer the chairman's question, the houses are disposed of. They have been advertised for disposal and we expect bids to be opened this June. Considering that they are disposed of this June, the total effect would be $20,500.

Mr. BLATNIK. When the contract was initially entered into, did you have enough information or was there some legal misinterpretation, or what?

Colonel VIVIAN. Possibly a legal misinterpretation, sir. The authorizing document was considered to be broad enough to cover the situation raised by the Comptroller General.

Mr. BLATNIK. After you entered into the contract, and performed all these services, then you were informed that the contract was not valid?

Colonel VIVIAN. That is correct.

Mr. SCHERER. Will you explain to me the basis of the contract, I do not understand what happened.

Colonel VIVIAN. Yes. Ordinarily, when we go into a large project, in an isolated area like at Chief Joseph Dam, we have to provide certain facilities for our key employees to live in. We struck a compromise on this project and provided only 40 permanent houses and 37 temporary houses for our people to live in, and by arrangement with the city of Bridgeport, we were able to have these houses placed within the city limits.

Now we had a problem of providing for police and fire protection, for street lighting, street maintenance, and snow removal. The city said we will provide these things for you, for a consideration—that being a little over $2,000 a year. And we entered into an agreement to that effect.

Mr. BLATNIK. Had you located the people, these workers, outside the city limits, closer to the project, you would have had to provide those services?

Colonel VIVIAN. That is correct—at a much greater cost.

Mr. BLATNIK. I see.

Any further questions?

(No response.)

Thank you very much. The committee is adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 12:20 p.m. the committee was adjourned, to reconvene at 10 a.m. Wednesday, May 13, 1959.)

(The following was furnished for insertion:)

NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS,
Washington, D.C., June 5, 1959.

Hon. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,
Chairman, Public Works Committee,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: There are enclosed reports of the following committees which were adopted by the delegates in attendance at the 46th National Convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress held May 13–15, 1959, at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington:

Projects committee, Representative Phil Weaver, of Nebraska, chairman.

Resolutions committee, Representative Paul G. Rogers, of Florida, chairman.

Irrigation and reclamation committee, Representative J. Edgar Chenoweth, of Colorado, chairman.

Industrial water use, pollution abatement, wildlife and recreation committee, Representative John A. Blatnik, of Minnesota, chairman.

This convention was attended by 325 registered delegates from 50 States, including Alaska and Hawaii, and from Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia, in addition to several score unregistered delegates, guests, visitors, representatives of the press, radio, television, etc.

These delegates were from all sections of the country, representing both legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government; State, city, county, and other local governmental agencies and interested groups; commercial, waterway, flood control, and reclamation associations; agricultural, labor, industrial and trade organizations, and transportation interests; with memberships totaling several million.

We believe this expression of representatives of such different interests and pursuits is strong evidence of the general sentiment of the people of the United States concerning the matters dealt with in these reports, and we shall greatly appreciate your careful consideration of these recommendations.

Sincerely yours,

H. H. BUCKMAN, *President.*

REPORT OF THE PROJECTS COMMITTEE

MAY 15, 1959.

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
President, National Rivers and Harbors Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In pursuance of the call of the President, your projects committee met on May 13, 1959, to consider the projects submitted since the last session of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. Hearings were afforded all who made appearance.

The committee at this session has examined 54 proposals embracing all resource improvements with which this Congress is concerned, including navigable waterways, harbors, flood control, hurricane protection, soil conservation, reclamation, and water conservation.

Of the proposals examined, this committee is convinced that 27 constitute projects sound in concept, needful, and sufficiently advanced in status to warrant endorsement, involving a total estimated cost of $291,145,800. Nine proposals appear to be without sufficiently advanced development to warrant project endorsement at this time, but are believed to be meritorious and entitled to further consideration by this committee, if and when additional information may be adequate to warrant an endorsed status. We find that on 13 proposals,

surveys have been authorized but the reports of said surveys have not been completed and we, therefore, recommend in these cases that the Congress request the appropriate authority to complete reports of its investigations and surveys as soon as practicable in order that action may be taken toward classification by this Congress. We find five proposals which on preliminary examination appears to be desirable and needful, and we accordingly recommend that engineering and economic investigations of survey scope be made in these cases with a view to developing projects for subsequent authorization.

Appendix A of this report sets forth in detail a list of all proposals and projects examined and the action taken thereon.

Since our national convention last year, the Congress enacted Public Law 85–500, the omnibus river and harbor and flood control bill, which was approved by the President on July 3, 1958. This act authorized construction of 139 river and harbor, beach erosion, and flood control projects in 44 States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

The total estimated Federal cost of work authorized in the bill is $1,556,230,500, of which $1,356,230,500 is for the Corps of Engineers and $200 million is for Missouri River Basin work by the Department of Interior.

The grand total is broken down as follows:

Type of improvement	Number of projects	Estimated cost
Navigation and beach erosion	71	$202,350,700
Flood control	68	545,579,800
Basin authorization	12	608,300,000
Department of Interior (Missouri River)	1	200,000,000
Totals	152	1,556,230,500

There are also authorizations for 61 surveys in 27 States and Hawaii. In addition the act contained several general provisions, including a section on water supply which liberalizes the policy applicable to advance provisions of facilities needed to meet future needs. This section is particularly appropriate to the future planning of Federal reservoir projects in order to serve the expanding economy in an orderly manner. Section 208 of the act eliminated preliminary examination reports. This and other improvements are expected to provide more economical and faster preparation of survey reports.

The projects included in the act of high importance to the Nation's expanding economy and should be provided as soon as practicable. Your projects committee, therefore, recommends that the Congress of the United States be requested to give consideration to early appropriation of funds for construction of these projects.

Flood control became a major part of the national water resource investment program when, in 1928, the Congress declared a national interest in preventing human suffering and economic losses from floods in the Mississippi Valley, and authorized the alluvial valley project. In 1936 flood control was authorized on a nationwide basis. The flood control projects of the Corps of Engineers completed or placed in partial operation have already prevented flood damages totaling about $9 billion, which is about twice the amount invested. The reservoir system of the Corps of Engineers with millions of acre-feet of storage capacity are mitigating the damaging effects of floodwaters and are benefiting water supplies, pollution abatement, recreation, and fish and wildlife. However, construction of authorized projects and additional authorizations are necessary to alleviate flood conditions in other parts of the country. The devastating floods in the Ohio River Basin this year, as well as those along the west coast and in the Atlantic and Gulf States during the past few years, are fresh in our minds and show that much remains to be done in the field of flood control particularly in the determination of the feasibility of projects for the prevention of these flood damages and the loss of human lives. Where and when another great flood may strike is not known but it could be in any river basin at any time.

The inland waterways which now total over 22,000 miles handled about 115 billion ton-miles of cargo in the calendar year 1957. This does not include the Great Lakes which in 1957 handled over 117 billion ton-miles. There are over 400 improved coastal harbors.

The hydroelectric power production facilities of the Corps of Engineers are contributing greatly to alleviating power shortages, particularly in the critically deficient Northwest region. During the fiscal year 1958, 27 billion kilowatts were generated at projects operated by the corps, representing 20 percent of the total hydroelectric power produced by all sources in the Nation.

As we all know, the Corps of Engineers survey program is nationwide and it includes investigations called for by Congress to determine the practical means of reduction of loss of human lives and damages to property. Reports recommending flood control works on many of the most severely damaged areas through the country have been completed and submitted to Congress by the Chief of Engineers. As a result of hurricane damage to our coastal and tidal areas, three projects, New Bedford-Fairhaven, Narragansett Bay, and Texas City were authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1958.

Many other areas which have been severely damaged have been designated for detailed study and a number of these investigations are well advanced. Congress has also authorized investigations to study hurricanes including the securing of data on hurricane frequency and behavior and the establishment of means to prevent the loss of lives and property that have been experienced. It is evident, therefore, that the development of plans for the control of floods and minimizing the destructive force of hurricanes are of paramount importance. In this connection, we must never for one moment lose sight of the objectives of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress in supporting this great program of water resource development.

The need for funds for carrying out investigations for flood control, hurricanes, navigation and related uses is as urgent at this time as any time in the history of this program. The investigations should go forward in order that a well planned construction program can be made for the time that construction funds will be available for those projects which may be recommended as a result of these studies and that are authorized by Congress. Although much work remains to be done in the field of water resource development throughout the country, we feel that the problem is being expertly handled by the Federal agencies in cooperation with the States concerned. The need for full scale development of our water resource program is greater today than ever before. The projects committee, therefore, considers it highly important that sufficient funds be provided in order that the Federal agencies can carry out their respective water resource program in an orderly fashion. Your committee is concerned over the large backlog of investigations authorized by Congress to be carried out by the various Federal agencies and recommends that appropriations be increased at this time in order that the backlog be reduced and that an adequate reserve of current projects may be built up for activation particularly at this time when the economy of the nation appears to warrant construction of worthwhile public works.

We wish to commend the various Federal agencies involved in the investigations and provisions of water resource projects on their improvements in development of sound procedures of project analysis and formulation, and the increased cooperation among agencies and with the States and local interests. We believe that true partnership between the Federal Government and its citizens lies not only in the sharing of costs, but also from the common sharing of problems and their development and solution. An example is the many hurricane studies being made along the eastern and southern seaboards, in which the States, local municipalities and many of the Federal agencies are cooperating in making these studies.

Respectfully submitted.

PHIL WEAVER, *Chairman.*

NOTE A.—A project which has been placed in class II, III, IV or V by the committee may be reexamined from time to time upon due application and the submission of material supplementary information, with a view to advancing its classification; but no project will be reported upon by the committee more than once in each year.

NOTE B.—Attention is called to the fact that when a project is once put in class I—Endorsed, such status continues and it is unnecessary to follow up at subsequent sessions with new applications. All projects "Endorsed" by the Congress, upon the recommendations of the committee, retain their status until finally constructed, unless such action is rescinded by the Congress, and the Congress stands pledged to do everything possible to assist in reaching that goal.

APPENDIX A.—*Applications for approval of projects received by the projects committee*

[Letter "R" following the project number indicates revision of a previous application]

DIVISION I—ENDORSED[1]

Docket No.	Name of project	State or States	Division	Classification
728-R6	Morehead City Harbor	North Carolina	South Atlantic	I
813-R2	Pantego Creek and Cucklers Creek	do	do	I
823-R	Baltimore Harbor and channels	Maryland	North Atlantic	I
840-R	Freeport Harbor	Texas	Southwestern	I
841-R	Galveston Harbor and channel; Houston ship channel; and Texas City channel.	do	do	I
863-R	Boston Harbor (reserved channel)	Massachusetts	Northeastern	I
883-R4	San Juan Harbor	Puerto Rico	South Atlantic	I
890-R5	Kahului Harbor, Maui	Territory of Hawaii.	Pacific Ocean	I
892-R	Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway.	Texas	Southwestern	I
1097-R	Turkey Creek Reservoir	Kansas	Missouri River	I
1097-A-R	Sutphen Mills Reservoir	do	do	I
1097-B-R	Woodbine Reservoir	do	Missouri River	I
1097-C-R	Humboldt Reservoir	do	do	I
1097-D-R	Camp Creek Reservoir	do	do	I
1097-E-R	Onaga Reservoir	do	do	I
1097-F-R	Grove Reservoir	do	do	I
1097-G-R	Clinton Reservoir	do	do	I
1099-R	Michigan City Harbor	Indiana	North Central	I
1110-R	Bayfield Harbor	Wisconsin	do	I
1119	Saxon Harbor	do	do	I
1120	Two Rivers Harbor	do	do	I
1121	Mississippi River, Baton Rouge to the Gulf of Mexico, modifications of.	Louisiana	Lower Mississippi Valley.	I
1124	Port Everglades Harbor	Florida	South Atlantic	I
1125	Yaquina Bay and Harbor	Oregon	North Pacific	I
1129	Shenango River Reservoir	Pennsylvania and Ohio.	Ohio River	I
1133	Caesar Creek Reservoir	Ohio	do	I
1135	Santa Cruz small craft harbor	California	South Pacific	I

DIVISION II—MERITORIOUS[2]

781-R5	Raystown Reservoir	Pennsylvania	North Atlantic	II
793-R6	Cleves flood protection	Ohio	Ohio River	II
1039-R3	New York Harbor; entrance channels and anchorage areas.	New York and New Jersey	North Atlantic	II
1100-R	Wilmington Harbor	North Carolina	South Atlantic	II
1114-R	Flint River channelization, flood control, hydroelectric power, water conservation.	Georgia	do	II
1116-R	Apponaug Cove	Rhode Island	New England	II
1123	Delaware River, Philadelphia to the sea, anchorages.	Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware	North Atlantic	II
1139	Municipal commercial harbor at Dubuque on upper Mississippi River (dredging).	Iowa	North Central	II
1140	North Branch Park River flood control.	Connecticut	New England	II

See footnotes at end of table, p. 39.

APPENDIX A.—*Applications for approval of projects received by the projects committee*—Continued

DIVISION III—EXPEDITIOUS REPORT ON AUTHORIZED SURVEY REQUESTED[3]

Docket No.	Name of project	State or States	Division	Classification
876-R4	Whitewater River, West Fork, at Brookville.	Indiana	Ohio River	III
1039-A-R3	New York Harbor anchorage area (port of New York entrance channel project).	New York and New Jersey.	North Atlantic	III
1062-R	Passaic River Basin flood control	New Jersey	do	III
1086-R	Port of New York to St. Lawrence River Waterway.	New York, Vermont, and Quebec, Canada.	do	III
1094-R	Rend Lake	Illinois	Lower Mississippi Valley.	III
1096-R	Deep draft and small craft harbor development—Port San Luis.	California	South Pacific	III
1101-R	Cold River Dam	New Hampshire	New England	III
1122	Petersburg small boat harbor (expan- pansion of facility).	Alaska	North Pacific	III
1126	Norfolk Harbor and channel to Newport News.	Virginia	North Atlantic	III
1132	Great Lakes to Hudson River Waterway (New York State Barge Canal).	New York	do	III
1134	East Fork Reservoir; East Fork, Little Miami River.	Ohio	Ohio River	III
1136	Tidal flood protection or city of New London.	Connecticut	New England	III
1138	Mississinewa River Channel Improvement, Randolph County.	Indiana	Ohio River	III

DIVISION IV—PROJECTS RECOMMENDED FOR SURVEY[4]

1127	Southern Branch of Elizabeth River, Norfolk Harbor.	Virginia	North Atlantic	IV
1128	Imperial Beach Small Craft Harbor (Oneonta Lagoon).	California	South Pacific	IV
1130	Searsport	Maine	New England	IV
1131	New harbor navigation project	do	do	IV
1137	Brazos River and Harbor survey	Texas	Southwestern	IV

[1] Endorsed. This means that it is the judgment of the committee that the project is sound, needful and sufficiently advanced in status; and that its construction is justified by the public interest it will serve.

[2] Meritorious. This means that the committee believes that although the project is not sufficiently advanced in status to warrant its present endorsement, it is meritorious and that the committee is willing to consider in due course, its advancement to division I upon presentation by its sponsors of additional evidence justifying such action.

[3] Expeditious report on authorized survey requested. This means that the committee believes that the National Rivers and Harbors Congress should request the engineering authority to expedite any report on any authorized investigation or survey of the project to the end that appropriate further action may be had thereon in regard to its classification.

[4] Recommended for survey. This means that the committee believes that sufficient showing on behalf of the project has been made to warrant further examination in the form of an adequate survey by an appropriate agency of the Federal Government.

REPORT OF THE RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE

FOREWORD

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress, now in its 58th year, intends to continue its efforts toward an expanded program of water resource development. The continued economic well-being of our Nation depends upon such development and our membership, composed of Federal, State, and local officials has dedicated itself to it. We are determined that our efforts shall not be in vain. The stakes are too large to have it otherwise.

MAINTENANCE OF PROJECTS

This National Rivers and Harbors Congress recognizes and commends the attitude that Congress has adopted, respecting Federal waterway and flood control maintenance, by increasing appropriations therefor. This attitude is consistent with the contention of this body that if there is justification for building a waterway or a structure for flood control there is certainly justification for proper maintenance to permit their use to the fullest extent.

A large backlog of deferred maintenance has accumulated in many of the harbors and waterways of the Nation. Until this is overcome, the full potential of such projects cannot be realized.

We urge Congress to reassert and continue its policy of providing adequate maintenance funds for current maintenance, and additional funds to eliminate the backlog of deferred maintenance on those projects for which the Federal Government has assumed responsibility.

STUDY BACKLOG

In the past, the National Rivers and Harbors Congress has noted the substantial backlog of studies in the program of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. This backlog has been increased by the passage of the omnibus rivers and harbors and flood control bill during the last session of Congress and the new studies regularly being authorized by Congress. The orderly development of the Nation's water resources is dependent on the expeditious completion of these studies and a continuing program of new studies. Adequate appropriations and retention of highly qualified manpower are essential to complete the studies and reduce the backlog. In order to build an adequate staff of engineers and assistants to conduct these studies efficiently and improve the quality of water resource studies, it is necessary for the corps to anticipate a consistent and higher level of appropriations. It is urged that Congress increase these appropriations gradually for 2 or 3 years and not permit fluctuations to adversely affect the program.

FOREIGN PROJECTS

We urge the Nation's Congress to examine the matter of foreign projects financed directly or indirectly with funds of the United States. Such projects are not restricted by a ban on new starts, nor are they authorized after economic justification as are domestic water resource projects. We believe they should be authorized by the Congress on an individual basis and be subject to favorable cost-benefit ratios in the same manner as are domestic projects.

Domestic water resource projects cannot compete with blanket authorizations for foreign resource development as is now the case.

NO NEW STARTS

The attitude on the part of the Bureau of the Budget that there will be no new construction or planning starts of water resources projects destined to provide stability to this country is deplorable. For fiscal year 1960 we have the largest peacetime budget in our history and contrary to the needs and thinking of a large segment of our people it contains not one single new construction start. If this attitude continues the impact on the citizens of our 50 States will be terrific. It is our intention to devote our best efforts to methods of seeing that it does not continue, to the extent that we urge the Congress of the United States to enact appropriate legislation to assure a minimum of new starts each year.

ITEM VETO

We are alarmed by information in the Congressional Record of the previous Congress as to the possibility of a provision by which the President would be empowered to veto legislative provisions as well as appropriation items. Should Congress succumb to this suggestion by a former Director of the Bureau of the Budget our chances of carrying forward a public works program to meet the needs of our growing population will be practically nil. By the same token we stand to lose the confidence of our friendly foreign nations and the race for resource development by the Soviet Union. We can also be alert to efforts to curtail these programs through the imposition of a ceiling on expenditures as has been tried in the past.

OMNIBUS RIVER AND HARBOR LEGISLATION

The time has again arrived when the development of our resources can be well bolstered by enacting legislation to provide authority for the many worthy projects that have been studied and reported on by the respective Federal agencies. The proponents of these projects have been patient throughout the required study process and they now expect to see them acted on by the Congress, thereby enabling them to be eligible for planning funds. We urge the Congress to respect the patience thus far exhibited and authorize these worthy projects.

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

We join with the citizens of our Nation and those of our neighbor to the north in the realization of the St. Lawrence Seaway. Its helpful impact on the heartland of our Nation and elsewhere here and in Canada is conceded. To those who have labored long and hard for this accomplishment we offer our congratulations and with pardonable pride take a small amount of credit for the part we have played.

Moreover we join with our leaders and our people in expressing pleasure in the fact that Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth, will join our President to lend dignity to the formal opening of this important transportation artery on the 26th of June 1959.

TOLLS ON WATERWAYS

We strongly reaffirm our long-standing opposition to tolls on our waterways. These public properties benefit a large segment of our people and that benefit should not be subordinated to a desire by some elements to place a price tag on the use of these lifelines. We will continue to prevent strangulation of waterways by such imposition. Returns to our Federal Treasury through taxes realized make tolls needless.

LOCAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Repeated efforts to require a greater amount of local contribution on various water resource projects indicates a trend to divorce Federal fiscal responsibility from projects which are in the national interest. These projects are a national problem and should be financed with Federal funds with local contribution commensurate only with clearly defined local benefits. Local communities, however, should not be denied protection because of their inability to contribute.

WEATHER MODIFICATION RESEARCH

This Rivers and Harbors Congress supports a greatly expanded research program in the atmospheric sciences, with particular emphasis on weather modification due to its impact on future water resource development in the Nation.

Inasmuch as the National Science Foundation, created under Public Law 85–510, has this program as a portion of its responsibility, we urge the Congress of the United States to continue adequate appropriations in support of the full-scale program of the Foundation.

(Submitted to the convention and unanimously adopted.)

Report of Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation

COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

Representative J. Edgar Chenoweth of Colorado, chairman; J. W. Grimes, Pierre, S. Dak., vice chairman; Ival V. Goslin, Salt Lake City, Utah, engineer-secretary, Upper Colorado River Commission, secretary

MEMBERS

Arizona: Representative Stewart L. Udall, Tucson, member, Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

California: Representative B. F. Sisk, Fresno, Calif., member, Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

Colorado: Representative Byron G. Rogers, Denver; Harold H. Christy, Pueblo, director, National Reclamation Association.

Idaho: George L. Crookham, Jr., Caldwell, president, Guffey Water Development Association.

Kansas: Robert V. Smrha, chief engineer, division of water resources, State board of agriculture, Topeka.

Montana: Everett W. Rising, Washington representative, State Water Board of Montana.

Nebraska: Pete Badura, Ashton, president, Farwell Irrigation District.

Nevada: Representative Walter S. Baring Reno, member, Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

New Mexico: John P. Murphy, Albuquerque, secretary, New Mexico Reclamation Association.

North Dakota: Fred Frederickson, Valley City, Washington representative, Greater North Dakota Association.
Oklahoma: Frank Raab, Oklahoma City, president, Canton Irrigation District.
Oregon: Representative Al Ullman, Baker, member, Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.
South Dakota: J. W. Grimes, Pierre, S. Dak., State engineer.
Texas: Kenneth M. Smith, McAllen; water master, lower Rio Grande.
Utah: T. W. Jensen, Salt Lake City, secretary, Utah Water Users Association.
Washington: John Richardson, Olympia, Wash., supervisor, department of conservation and development.
Wyoming: State Senator Earl T. Bower, Worland.

INTRODUCTION

Two years ago at the 44th Annual Convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, President Overton Brooks announced the creation of the committee on irrigation and reclamation. The assembly approved the forming of this committee, adopted its report, and made the committee a permanent part of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

Purposes of the irrigation and reclamation committee

This committee has been directed to deal only with matters of general policy. At its inception the purposes of this committee were defined as the formulation of a policy and a program for the continued, orderly development by reclamation and irrigation of our water and land resources in the arid and semiarid regions of the West, and to suggest ways and means whereby the National Rivers and Harbors Congress may better cooperate and coordinate its efforts with the advocates of reclamation and irrigation.

Committee personnel

The personnel of the committee on irrigation and reclamation are listed on page 1 of this report. This committee is interested not only in irrigation and reclamation, but in flood control projects, rivers and harbors projects, and, in fact, all phases of water resource development.

PROGRESS

In this committee's report for 1957 to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, several policy and procedural recommendations were outlined. These were designed as guides and suggestions for implementing basic principles. The adoption of these recommendations by this organization has contributed greatly to a better understanding of water resource problems. It is gratifying to note that sponsors of projects are recognizing new possibilities for coordination of efforts and cooperation in developing water and land resources. This new spirit and its resultant accomplishments constitute progress—not because during the past year we feel that the program of project development has been accelerated to the point necessary or desirable—but because future results will prove the wisdom of united efforts.

As a result of cooperative efforts, Congress enacted a public works appropriation bill for fiscal 1959 that contained 65 unbudgeted water development projects of which 9 were reclamation "new starts."

During the past year, several projects were started under the Small Reclamation Projects Act. Presently, there are four project loan applications pending before the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of Congress. There are at least four additional projects under this act pending before the Department of the Interior. It is anticipated that these latter four projects will be submitted to Congress during its current session.

RECLAMATION IS MORE IMPORTANT TODAY THAN EVER BEFORE

Population increasing—productive land decreasing

The population of the United States continues to increase at a rate that provides approximately 3 million more mouths to feed each year. At the same time, we are losing more than a million acres of good agricultural land every year to highways, airports, municipal and suburban developments, industrial and military establishments, and by other means. These two opposing but interrelated influences pertaining to our need and capacity to produce speak for themselves.

Will agricultural production increase fast enough?

Our total farmland has remained about the same for the past 40 years. About the only means of increasing our farm acreage is through reclamation and drainage. It is doubtful whether production on our existing farmlands can be increased fast enough to meet the future demands of our growing population.

Another fact that has not been fully appreciated is that reclamation projects contribute only insignificant amounts to our crop surplus accumulations. As an example, wheat, upland cotton, corn, tobacco, and rice are the crops that have been giving the greatest headaches to our agricultural experts. Of these crops, only 2.2 percent of the wheat is raised on irrigated lands, and 5.3 percent of the upland cotton, 0.46 percent of the corn, 0.54 percent of the rice and none of the tobacco come from reclamation projects.

Reclamation is for the future

Many years are required, often a quarter of a century or more, to bring a major authorized multiple-purpose development into agricultural production. For instance, the Colorado River storage project and participating projects will require about 30 years for completion; the Columbia River Basin project at least 40 years, the Missouri River Basin project about 75 years, etc. An average reclamation project requires at least 10 years for completion and often longer. In many instances, it takes equivalent amounts of time to bring projects to the authorization stage.

RECLAMATION'S NATIONAL VALUES

Economists and financial experts have found that the overall reclamation program has proved to be an economically sound and financially feasible enterprise for the Federal Government. Every 4 years the value of crops produced on reclamation farms equals the total money appropriated for Federal reclamation since its inception 57 years ago. The cash value of the crops produced in 1957 was more than $900 million. Since the reclamation program was initiated in 1902, $13,277,661,000 worth of crops have been produced. The Federal Government has received nearly $3,500 million in Federal taxes derived from reclamation projects and adjacent trade areas since 1940. Irrigation farmers have repaid the Federal Treasury more than $134,789,000.

As emphasized many times, from a financial standpoint, reclamation projects repay the investment in many ways besides repaying to the United States all of the costs allocated to irrigation features without interest and the costs allocated to power and municipal water supplies with interest. Reclamation portions of Federal multiple-purpose developments create economic returns in the form of stabilized downstream flows for industrial waters, pollution abatement, and other benefits that are not reflected in the financial feasibility of irrigation use of water. Western reclamation projects develop floodwater as the irrigation water supply; thereby, accomplishing flood control as an important by-product. Flood control projects, as such, become less necessary because of irrigation water supply storage.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are believed to embody principles essential to a well-rounded yet progressive reclamation program that would be correlated with and complementary to a national program of development, utilization, and conservation of our Nation's water resources.

We are again confronted this year with a lack of budgetary recommendations for "new starts." There are still prevalent in the land many irrational and misinformed influences that are waging relentless opposition against effective and progressive water resources development. Much of this opposition seems to be founded on the false premise that water resource development should be considered solely as an "antirecession" program to give the economy a boost when needed. This viewpoint fails to recognize the fundametal concept under lying the development of our natural resources which is to meet the demands of our growing population and expanding economy and at the same time, maintain our high standard of living. The National Rivers and Harbors Congress should support the position of the 10 Missouri River Basin States' Governors and the 4 upper Colorado River Basin States' Governors in their efforts to modify the "no new starts" policy.

Reclamation, flood control, and other water resources developments create new wealth, a vital prerequisite to the maintenance of our national economy

and our world leadership. We must stress the development of such new wealth within our country in order to continue investments in similar new wealth-producing projects in foreign lands.

It is recommended that:

(1) Where opposition to water development programs exists, officers members of and delegates to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress should act without delay to neutralize or combat such opposing influences with any effective means available at local, State, and National levels.

(2) Congress should appropriate funds for the construction of authorized projects for which advanced planning has been completed. Construction should not be subjected to a stop-and-go policy because that procedure is too costly and inefficient. Construction funds for reclamation portions of multiple-purpose developments should be accelerated to $300 million per year and maintained thereafter at a level that would be relatively consistent with the annual gross national product.

(3) The Congress of the United States should maintain and exercise its right to determine the policy and criteria under which all Federal water development projects will be authorized and constructed. This constitutional principle should be emphasized in the appropriation of funds and the designation of their use.

(4) On multiple-purpose projects, wherever practicable, the development of water resources should be preceded by basinwide planning.

(5) Power revenues derived from Federal projects should be used on a basinwide or areawide basis to assist in repayment of irrigation costs on Federal reclamation projects beyond the ability of the water users to repay.

(6) The principle of the interstate compact should be encouraged in order to avoid litigation between and among States and to preclude domination of the development and control of natural resources by Federal agencies.

(7) Procedures under which Federal water resources projects are investigated and reported should be simplified. The creation of a board of review or the office of coordinator would mean another obstacle in water resource development and should be opposed.

(8) Basic land and water inventories, soil and water research, snow surveys and stream forecasting should be continued, expanded, and modernized in order to provide adequate data for current and future planning.

(9) The use of conservancy-type districts capable of levying taxes on project beneficiaries as agencies to execute repayment contracts with the Federal Government should be encouraged in order to more equitably allocate costs of a project and meet the burden of expensive and complex project construction.

(10) In planning and contructing water resource projects the principle of supplying supplemental water to lands presently inadequately irrigated should be given priority over bringing new lands into cultivation.

(11) It is further recommended that the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, through its executive offices and appropriate committees:

(*a*) Accelerate its campaign in support of a water-utilization program designed to fully develop our land and water resources placing special emphasis on starting new water development projects that are financially feasible and economically justified and are now ready for construction;

(*b*) Continue to bring to the attention of the executive and legislative branches of our Federal Government the need for a continuous, progressive, planned program of project authorization;

(*c*) Urge and actively support adequate appropriations for investigating and planning water-use projects;

(*d*) Support legislation requiring compliance with and adherence to State water laws by Federal agencies.

SUMMARY

In summary, the purposes of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress shall be to promote the development, control, conservation, and utilization of the Nation's water resources, to work for the continuation of the services and the coordination of activities of Federal agencies dealing with water resources, to cooperate with and assist in securing authorization and construction of Federal water-use projects which meet with the approval of States and local agencies, to assist water users of the Nation in the economic development of river basins, to preserve the rights and interests

of the States in their water resources, to promote the enactment of legislation favorable to these principles, and to oppose legislation detrimental to the orderly and progressive development of the river basins of the United States of America.

The Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation unanimously approved the foregoing statement and recommends that it be adopted by the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

IVAL V. GOSLIN, *Secretary.*

REPORT OF COMMITTEE OF INDUSTRIAL WATER USE, POLLUTION ABATEMENT, WILDLIFE, AND RECREATION

The committee reviewed its report adopted at the annual convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress held May 14, 1958, and reaffirmed the broad and constructive principles for development of adequate water supplies set forth therein, emphasizing particularly the need for constructive policies relating to conservation, municipal, and domestic use, pollution abatement, flood control, irrigation, recreation, industrial use, and other beneficial purposes.

The chairman presented a record of accomplishments under the provisions of Public Law 660, providing for Federal assistance to communities for the construction of waste treatment facilities. He submitted charts showing comparative expenditures for such facilities during the 5 years, 1952–56 prior to the enactment of Public Law 660. Contract awards for sewage treatment works construction averaged $220 million annually during that period. In the first full year of the Federal grants program, 1957, construction expanded 58 percent over the previous annual average to reach $351 million. The second year of the program, 1958, brought an even greater increase in construction, with contract awards reaching $389 million—75 percent over the earlier 5-year average. After only 2 years of operation the program has proved a great success, resulting in construction which has cleaned up 14,000 miles of the Nation's streams for a multitude of water uses. The great bulk of this increase in construction during 1957 and 1958 came from projects receiving Federal aid. These facts point strongly to the conclusion that if it had not been for these grants, sewage treatment works construction would have remained at about the average level experienced during the 5-year period preceding the current program.

It is the sense of the committee that even the limited program permitted by Public Law 660 has been an outstanding success.

The chairman called attention to the fact, however, that expert estimates concurred in the conclusion that the essential rate of construction of such facilities over the next 8 years was of the order of $575 million annually which will be necessary to eliminate the huge backlog of construction needs and provide for plant obsolescence, replacement, and population growth demands. These surveys also indicate that a doubling of present Federal funds is necessary in order to increase construction to the required level of $575 million annually.

In the light of these facts the committee deplored the attitude expressed by the Bureau of the Budget and the President that Federal participation in this program should be discontinued. It was the sense of the committee that legislation should be promptly enacted to strengthen the provisions of existing law for dealing with this urgent problem, including increased Federal financial assistance to communities and improved enforcement procedures. In this connection, the chairman called attention to the principal provisions of H.R. 3610 recently reported favorably by the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives. These include:

(1) Grants for projects in the amount of 30 percent of the estimated reasonable cost thereof or $500,000, whichever is the smaller, with the provision that no grant of more than $250,000 shall be approved for a project in any State until all previously filed applications from that State and political subdivisions thereof for grants not exceeding $250,000 have first been approved;

(2) Municipalities to join together to build joint treatment facilities with the amount of grant allocable to each community as if it were a separate project;

(3) Reallocation of grant funds from States not using funds because of lack of projects to States having projects approved for which grants have not been made because of lack of funds;

(4) $100 million to be appropriated for purposes of construction grants for any fiscal year; and

(5) An aggregate of $1 billion to be appropriated for such purposes.

Thereupon, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"*Resolved:*

"1. That this committee recommends the adoption of H.R. 3610 and respectfully urges that the National Rivers and Harbors Congress address a communication to each member of the Congress of the United States strongly endorsing the provisions of H.R. 3610 and recommending its immediate enactment into law. A suggested form of letter for this purpose is attached as exhibit A to this report.

"2. That this committee recommends the appropriation of $45 million for fiscal year 1960 to implement the provisions of Public Law 660.

"3. That this committee recommends an appeal to the Congress from the decision of the Bureau of the Budget and the President for reconsideration of the decision heretofore announced to include no funds in future budget estimates for Federal assistance in the construction of pollution abatement works in accordance with the principles of Public Law 660.

"4. That this committee requests each member of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress to enlist support from Members of the Congress of the United States for the actions proposed in the preceding resolutions."

The attention of the committee was directed to the long continuing problem of pollution of the Potomac River in the District of Columbia region. It was the sense of the committee that sanitation standards in the area of the Nation's Capitol should set a standard for the world and that the polluted condition of the Potomac River in the District of Columbia metropolitan area demanded immediate and constructive action by the Federal Government. The committee was gratified to learn that a satisfactory plan for dealing with this problem had been evolved as a result of an enforcement conference held under Public Law 660. The committee expressed satisfaction that as a first step improvements in the Blue Plains sewage treatment plant have been completed, but is was strongly of the opinion that the additional elements of the plan involving the construction of a system of interceptor sewers should be undertaken promptly.

Thereupon, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"*Resolved,* That the committee recommends to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress the adoption of a resolution in the form attached to this report as exhibit B."

Reports from representatives of all sections of the Nation contained dramatic evidence of growing water problems. It is clear that the population of the United States will continue to grow rapidly, that the needs of industry, agriculture, and the general public for adequate supplies of water will continue to mount; that with improved means of transportation and greater leisure time, demands for recreational facilities for hunting, fishing, boating, and related forms of enjoyment will grow apace, and that the growth of industry and population will aggravate and intensify the already serious pollution abatement problem confronting the Nation. Accordingly, the committee reaffirms its conviction that all uses of water are interrelated and are of concern to the public generally, and that conservation, control, and equitable disposition of our water resources are matters of profound interest to the development of the national economy and the welfare of all the people. It is evident that the water problem will become as vital to the national interest in 10 years as the missile program is today. Clearly, also, the increasing pressures of various public demands for water use urgently require the long-range planning and effective coordination to assure maximum realization of the public values inherent in our precious water resources.

In view of the growing importance of water resource development, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

"*Resolved:*

"1. That recreation should be included as definitely as any other factor in the evaluation and programing of land and water development projects.

"2. That the committee records its continued adherence to the principle that provision be made for storage and reservoir projects to increase needed low flows downstream, without reimbursement, to the extent warranted at present or during the economic life of the project where the benefits of such low flows are widespread, general, and nonexclusive.

"3. That the committee recommends improved coordination among the agencies at all levels of Government for the more effective development and use of water resources; and

"4. That the committee recommends a more adequate program to ascertain, assemble, and disseminate in useful form basic data relative to surface and ground water resources."

* * * * * * *

EXHIBIT A

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress, assembled for its 46th annual convention in the city of Washington, D.C., on May 15, 1959, has considered the growing urgency of the problem of water pollution abatement.

It appears that with the rising population, rapidly increasing per capita water use and developing industrial and recreational needs for water, current levels of expenditures for pollution abatement facilities are grossly inadequate. Reliable estimates clearly demonstrate the imperative necessity for a level of expenditures for these purposes of approximately $575 million annually.

Evidence submitted to the convention compels the conclusion that only through increased Federal assistance to local communities can this national problem be solved. Accordingly, the National Rivers and Harbors Congress respectfully urges the immediate enactment into law of H.R. 3610, which it believes to be an essential step in the constructive solution of this growing national problem.

EXHIBIT B

Whereas at the conclusion of a conference held under the enforcement provisions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act providing for enforcement measures to abate pollution of interstate waters, the conferees unanimously agreed that the District of Columbia will provide secondary treatment (including chlorination of the effluent when necessary at its Blue Plains plant) and reduce pollution of storm water overflows by constructing a system of interceptor sewers, and that the construction of such interceptor sewers be completed at the end of calendar year 1966 and appropriate financial arrangements be made to accomplish this end;

Whereas the installation, maintenance, and operation of such remedial facilities are necessary to control pollution of the interstate waters of the Potomac River flowing past the Nation's Capital;

Whereas the present polluted condition of the Potomac River as it flows through the District of Columbia makes the river unfit for recreational uses and constitutes a health hazard, symbolizing the seriousness of similar pollution problems throughout the Nation;

Whereas the District of Columbia is the Capital of the Nation, requiring that sanitation standards in the area should set an example for the world;

Whereas the District of Columbia needs financial assistance in order to reduce storm water overflows by 1966 and because of the national character of the city the Federal Government has an added responsibility to help finance the higher standards required of the District of Columbia: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the National Rivers and Harbors Congress urgently recommends that the Congress of the United States, the District of Columbia, and the Maryland and Virginia communities concerned take immediate appropriate action to secure abatement of pollution of the Potomac River in the Washington metropolitan area; and be it further

Resolved, That the National Rivers and Harbors Congress recommends that the Congress of the United States enact appropriate legislation authorizing Federal financial assistance to the District of Columbia for the construction of a system of interceptor sewers to abate further pollution of the Potomac River due to storm water overflows.

Representative John A. Blatnik, Chisholm, Minn., *Chairman*

William J. Hull, Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Washington, D.C., *Secretary*

MEMBERS

New England Division:

Walter G. White, chairman, Water Resources Board, State of New Hampshire, Concord, N.H.

North Atlantic Division:

George R. Shanklin, chief engineer, Division of Water Policy and Supply, State of New Jersey, Trenton, N.J.

South Atlantic Division:

Miles J. Smith, vice chairman, North Carolina Board of Conservation and Development, Salisbury, N.C.

Harry H. Saunders, vice president, St. Joe Paper Co., Port St. Joe, Fla.

Southwestern Division:
Judge J. E. Sturrock, general manager, Texas Water Conservation Association, Austin, Tex., vice chairman.
Lower Mississippi Valley Division:
Leonard N. White, engineer, Arkansas Geological and Conservation Commission, Little Rock, Ark.
Calvin T. Watts, assistant director, Department of Public Works, State of Louisiana, Baton Rouge, La.
North Central Division:
Marvin Fast, executive director, Great Lakes Commission, Ann Harbor, Mich.
Missouri River Division:
Milo W. Hoisveen, chief engineer, North Dakota Water Commission, Bismarck, N. Dak.
Ohio River Division:
Laban P. Jackson, commissioner of conservation, State of Kentucky, Frankfort, Ky.
North Pacific Division:
Marshall N. Dana, chairman, Commission of Public Docks, Portland, Oreg.
South Pacific Division:
Walter G. Schulz, division chief engineer, division of design and construction, Department of Water Resources, State of California, Sacramento, Calif.

RIVER AND HARBOR AND FLOOD CONTROL OMNIBUS BILL, 1959

WEDNESDAY, MAY 13, 1959

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HABRORS,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to adjournment, at 10:15 a.m., in room 1302, New House Office Building, Hon. John A. Blatnik presiding.

Mr. BLATNIK. The Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee of the House Committee on Public Works will please come to order.

We will resume public hearings on rivers and harbors projects.

BAYOUS PETIT ANSE, TIGRE, AND CARLIN, LA. (S. DOC. 70); BAYOU LAFOURCHE, LA. (H. DOC 112)

Mr. BLATNIK. We will open this morning with our colleague and friend from Louisiana, Congressman Edwin Willis. We have had the opportunity of visiting your State and we know the important problems they have had in connection with the lower Mississippi and other public works projects. Some of the members have been there several times.

Mr. Willis, I understand you have another committee meeting this morning. We appreciate your being here on time and waiting until the hearing started. Will you proceed now with your statement?

STATEMENT OF HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF LOUISIANA

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I am always glad to appear before your committee to renew acquaintances and express appreciation for the very fine work this committee has done with reference to projects in my area.

I would like to have the privilege, during the day, of sending a statement in support of the navigation projects which you have listed as Bayous Petit Anse, Tigre, and Carlin, La., and Bayou Lafourche, La. I would like to have the statement appear as though I had presented it personally.

Mr. BLATNIK. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STATEMENT OF EDWIN E. WILLIS

Mr. Chairman, I appear in support of the navigation projects being considered today known as the Bayous Petit Anse, Tigre, and Carlin project and the Bayou Lafourche project.

Representatives of the Corps of Engineers are in attendance and will outline the details of these two projects and explain their economic justification, but I want to point out some of their important functions to the economic growth and development of those areas in my congressional district.

BAYOUS PETIT, ANSE, TIGRE, AND CARLIN

In connection with this project let me point out that the town of Delcambre is the center of a very important fish and shrimp area and is located a few miles north of Vermilion Bay, which in turn becomes the Gulf of Mexico. There is an existing canal or channel from the bay to the town of Delcambre, but it is completely inadequate to serve the navigation requirements of the people.

Literally hundreds of boats are regularly engaged in fishing and shrimp trawling in the Vermilion Bay area. These fishing boats come from the local area as well as the general gulf coast area. These boats discharge their catch at Delcambre and purchase their fuel, ice, and other supplies there.

As indicated, the existing channel is woefully inadequate and because of silting loses its identity as a channel as it flows into Vermilion Bay.

As is well known, the entire gulf coast area is subject to sudden squalls and heavy winds and sometimes is visited by hurricanes, and Delcambre has become a place of refuge where these boats must hurriedly assemble when caught in or threatened with inclement weather conditions. But, as might be expected, the existing channel cannot accommodate normal traffic much less take care of these emergencies.

Accordingly, the Corps of Engineers has recommended modification of the existing Bayous Petit Anse, Tigre, and Carlin project so as to provide a channel 7 feet deep at mean low gulf level over a bottom width of 60 feet; together with a mooring area along the right bank of Bayou Carlin below the south edge of Delcambre, 9 feet deep at mean low gulf level, about 1,300 feet long, with a width varying from about 200 feet at the upstream end to 125 feet at the downstream end. This is a very worthy project, completely economically justified, and I urge its approval by this committee and ultimate authorization by the Congress.

THE BAYOU LAFOURCHE PROJECT

Bayou Lafourche commences at the town of Donaldsonville and runs south for a very long distance to the Gulf of Mexico. It serves a very large and populous area. There are highways on either bank of the bayou and the entire reach of Bayou Lafourche is so thickly settled that it has been referred to as the longest Main Street in the United States.

The project proposes an improvement to navigation of the lower portion of Bayou Lafourche commencing at the Intracoastal Canal at Larose, La., down to the Gulf of Mexico. This is one of the most important fish and shrimp areas along the gulf coast. And, in addition to sugarcane and other important crops there, considerable industrial development has taken place, and some of the most important oil and gas operations, both inshore and offshore in the tidelands, are conducted in this general area. There is probably as much traffic in Bayou Lafourche as in any other comparable stream in the United States. But from Larose down to the gulf the project dimensions of the bayou are only 6 feet deep by 60 feet wide. The unusually heavy traffic causes unbearable congestion, and, because of the shallow depth and narrow width of the stream, the boats, tugs, and barges cause damage to themselves and installations along the bayou. Accordingly, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors has recommended modification of the existing project for Bayou Lafourche to provide for dredging an auxiliary channel 12 feet deep and 125 feet wide from the Intracoastal Canal at Larose, along Grand Bayou Blue to Bayou Lafourche below the highway bridge at Leeville; thence continuing the same dimensions in Bayou Lafourche to the 12-foot contour in the gulf. Above Leeville, the recommended modification would provide a channel 9 feet deep and 100 feet wide to near the lower limits of Golden Meadow. Also included in the recommendation is the restoration and extension of the jetties at Belle Pass from the 6- to the 12-foot depth, if found advisable, in order to reduce maintenance dredging. And, finally, the project contemplates dredging a channel 12 feet deep and 125 feet wide from Bayou Lafourche at Leeville through the Southwest Louisiana Canal to and through Bayou Rigaud.

The fact of the matter is that the realization of this project is long, long overdue and I urge its approval by this committee and its authorization by the Congress.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Angus H. McRae, Assistant Chief of Civil Works will testify on behalf of the Army Corps of Engineers, and will give us a brief technical description of the project.

STATEMENT OF ANGUS H. McRAE, ASSISTANT CHIEF OF CIVIL WORKS, CORPS OF ENGINEERS, U.S. ARMY

Mr. MCRAE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First we will take the Bayou Lafourche project.

This project is a stream that extends from the Mississippi River at Donaldsonville upstream from New Orleans, considerably upstream, down to the Gulf of Mexico. This bayou, the natural bayou, has a project on it 6 feet by 60 feet. It is very crowded. As a matter of fact, there has been considerable damage to boats and installations along the bayou, and there is need for improvement there to provide for the channel depth and eliminate the damage that has been created.

The plan recommended by the Chief of Engineers provides for an auxiliary channel 12 feet deep by 125 feet wide along Grand Bayou Blue from a point near Larose, La., to Leeville, then along Bayou Lafourche to the gulf, out through existing jetties at that point. Then there is a 9- by 100-foot plan for a channel from Leeville up to Golden Meadow, and a 12- by 125-foot channel from Leeville, at the junction of the improvement, over to Grand Isle, off Bayou Rigaud.

The cost of the project is estimated to be $4,664,000 Federal; $1,343,000 non-Federal. The project is justified with a benefit-cost ratio of 1.4 to 1. Local cooperation required on the project for the local people to furnish land, easements, rights-of-way, spoil disposal areas, and alter pipelines and other facilities, and also provide a 12- by 125-foot connection between the two legs of the project in the vicinity of Golden Meadow.

The agencies are in agreement with the project in general. The State of Louisiana approved it, but the Fish and Wildlife people would like for us to be cautious with the deposit of spoil material to minimize damage to fish and wildlife resources.

The Department of the Interior disagrees to some extent, and states that the project will introduce more salt water into the area, and there will be some damage to oysters. But we have given assurance that we will cooperate with the agency during the construction period to minimize damages to the fish and wildlife.

They also suggest that we go back from Bayou LaFourche to what is known as the 40-arpent line to construct this auxiliary channel, this line being a measurement which stems from the French and Spanish grants of land along the bayou, and a 40-arpent line is recognized generally in Louisiana as 190 feet, approximately, as a linear measure, and as a land measure, approximately eighty-five hundredths of an acre. That would create a number—quite a few more land acquisitions than would otherwise be required. That would mean that the cost of right-of-way would be increased, and local interests object to that particular location because it would take some good land along the bayou.

That completes my statement on the Bayou Lafourche project.

Mr. BLATNIK. Any questions?

(No response.)

Mr. BLATNIK. Will you proceed, then, with the next project in Louisiana?

Mr. MCRAE. The next project is Bayous Petit Anse, Tigre, and Carlin, in Louisiana. These bayous are in the general area southwest of New Iberia, La., southwest of Abbeyville, La.

Mr. BLATNIK. We are having a little difficulty hearing you, Mr. McRae.

Mr. MCRAE. Yes, sir. These bayous connect with the present gulf intercoastal waterway and the Gulf of Mexico through Vermillion Bay and Southwest Pass at the gulf. This pass is not shown on the map, but it is considerably south of the entrance into Vermillion Bay.

The plan of improvement for this project as recommended by the Chief of Engineers provides for a 7- by 60-foot channel through the canal at the lower end and for a harbor refuge just in the outskirts of the town of Delcambre, that being 9 by 1,300 feet, 200 feet on the upper end to 125 feet at the downstream end.

The cost of the improvement for the canal at the south end would be $41,000 Federal, and for the turning basin the cost is $65,000 Federal, for a total of $107,000 Federal for the project. There would be a non-Federal cost of $42,000 for the turning basin.

The project is justified with benefit-cost ratio of 2.3 to 1 for the Avery Canal portion and 2.1 to 1 for the harbor of refuge.

Local cooperation consists of furnishing land easements, right-of-way, providing mooring facilities at the harbor of refuge, and an access road to that harbor, and there is a requirement for the establishment of a local body to regulate the mooring area in the harbor of refuge. They will maintain the harbor of refuge. The agency comments are—we have a request from them that they dispose of the spoil in such a manner as to minimize damage to fish and wildlife, and there are no objections on the part of the State of Louisiana. I might say, in connection with both projects, the Bureau of the Budget has no objection. That completes my statement on that project.

Mr. BLATNIK. Would you repeat again, Mr. McRae, the main purpose of this project in the harbor of refuge. Is that for transfer of shipping along the intercostal waterways, primarily for a place to tie up and refuel?

Mr. MCRAE. Even with storms of less force than those accompanying hurricanes, there is need for a place for particularly the shrimp fleet and oil shipping to have a place to get inland for protection from the weather. That is the primary purpose.

Mr. BLATNIK. Any questions?

(No response.)

Mr. BLATNIK. Thank you, Mr. McRae.

RED WING HARBOR, MINN. (H. DOC. 32)

Mr. BLATNIK. The next item is the "North central and Ohio River division," and the first navigation project under that is Red Wing Harbor, Minn.

Colonel Nauman.

STATEMENT OF COL. ARTHUR C. NAUMAN, ASSISTANT CHIEF OF CIVIL WORKS, CORPS OF ENGINEERS, U.S. ARMY

Colonel NAUMAN. Mr. Chairman, Red Wing Harbor, Minn., is a proposed industrial harbor, located about 67 miles below the head of navigation on the Mississippi River, at Minneapolis. There is no existing Federal project at Red Wing. The commerce existing and in prospect at Red Wing Harbor consists of coal, steel products, steel scrap metal.

The plan of improvement as recommended by the chief of engineers for Red Wing Harbor provides for a turning basin averaging 300 feet in width and 1,200 feet in length, with depths of 9 feet.

The total, estimated cost of the project, is $213,000, of which $179,800 is Federal cost, and $33,200 is non-Federal. This latter figure includes $4,000 cash contribution for land enhancement.

The benefit-cost ratio of the project is 1.28 to 1.

I might add, Mr. Chairman, that the Bureau of the Budget has no objection to the submission of this report to Congress. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service advises that the proposed improvement would have an insignificant effect on fish and wildlife resources, and the State of Minnesota is in favor of the project.

That, Mr. Chairman, concludes my summary on Red Wing Harbor.

Mr. BLATNIK. Will you repeat the cost-benefit ratio? Is it 1.28 to 1?

Colonel NAUMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLATNIK. The total cost is $213,000?

Colonel NAUMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLATNIK. Any questions?

(No response.)

Mr. BLATNIK. We have our very able colleague, Congressman Albert Quie here. Mr. Quie, would you join the colonel and present your statement at this time?

STATEMENT OF HON. ALBERT H. QUIE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MINNESOTA

Mr. QUIE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am happy to come here and appear before the committee on behalf of my constituents this morning because of the 9-foot channel in the Mississippi River, Red Wing, again becomes an important harbor, and there has been quite a tieup now in the desire for bringing boats into that harbor and I have a prepared statement, so rather than take the committee's time to read it through, I will just submit it and ask it appear as though read.

Mr. BLATNIK. The full statement will be included at this point in the record.

(The statement is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF ALBERT H. QUIE, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, FIRST DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

I am here this morning to urge favorable consideration by your committee of H.R. 1327, a bill to authorize the enlargement of the harbor at Red Wing, Minn., in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in his report submitted in House Document No. 32, 86th Congress, at an estimated cost to the United States of $174,400.

On June 27, 1956, the House Committee on Public Works adopted a resolution requesting the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors to review the reports on Red Wing Harbor, Minn., published in House Document No. 103, 76th Congress, 1st session, and other pertinent reports, with a view to determining whether any modification of the existing project should be made at that time with particular reference to channel improvement for industrial harbor purposes.

The need for Federal participation in the development of the harbor at Red Wing is urgent. Red Wing, Minn., is not only a community of major importance to the southeastern sector of Minnesota—but serves the surrounding agricultural area in two States, Minnesota and Wisconsin, as well.

Red Wing is a leader in manufacturing. It has earned recognition in industries which range from the tanning of leather to the manufacture of marine engines. It is served by the transportation arteries of rail, and Federal, State, and local highways.

This community is suffering from the great increase of traffic at the municipal levee and at the adjacent terminal of a grain company. This traffic has created sizable congestion for barge handling—congestion which is no small hazard for the craft entering and leaving the boat harbor.

I hope you will agree that Red Wing, which is of major importance to the surrounding, two-State area in the upper Midwest, should continue to increase movement of traffic through its harbor. Indeed, the economic health of the area is dependent, in no small measure, on Red Wing's growth. Coal, grain, flour and vegetable oils are among the many products which must pass through the harbor.

If Red Wing and the neighboring area is to keep up its pace, it must depend on adequate harbor facilities. Improvement of the harbor will enable not only the community but the area it serves to contribute to the economic growth of Minnesota.

Without taking more of the committee's time, I urge that you include the Red Wing harbor as part of the omnibus bill.

Mr. QUIE. Thank you. I am representing the people of Red Wing, and the area around there, the two States of Minnesota and Wisconsin, and they are both very desirous of the added facilities this harbor would provide.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BLATNIK. I am very familiar with the area. It is a lovely, rich agricultural area, where some of the early pioneer towns in Minnesota are located. And the shipping has been increasing right along, year by year, especially these postwar years.

Mr. QUIE. Yes, sir. It was originated as a place where the wheat would move to the Mississippi River and move down and it is still an important grain terminal, but then the other industries of the area are increasing in importance every year.

Mr. BLATNIK. Thank you.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER AT DUBUQUE, IOWA

Mr. BLATNIK. The next project is the Mississippi River at Dubuque, Iowa, House Document 56. Colonel Nauman, please proceed.

Colonel NAUMAN. Mr. Chairman, Dubuque Harbor, Iowa, is located on the right bank of the Mississippi River about 580 miles above the mouth of the Ohio River. The commerce at Dubuque, presently and in prospect, includes sulfur, molasses, and sand and gravel. These items are being handled over an existing municipal barge terminal on the Mississippi River adjacent to the downstream site of the harbor entrance. There is no Federal project existing at Dubuque.

The plan of improvement recommended by the Chief of Engineers contemplates construction of a commercial harbor with a depth of 9 feet covering an area of 9 acres. The estimated total cost of this project is $43,000, of which $38,000 is Federal and $5,000 non-Federal.

The benefit-cost ratio of this project is 8.8 to 1. The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report to Congress and the State of Iowa is in favor of the project.

That concludes my summary on this project, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BLATNIK. I am not quite clear, Colonel. This will merely enlarge the existing commercial harbor?

Colonel NAUMAN. No, sir. The existing commercial harbor is on the river bank at Dubuque. This project contemplates improving the sheltered harbor inward from the river channel.

Mr. BLATNIK. What are the facilities on the north shore of the area marked "Limits of dredging"? You have a railroad track there and several sheds.

Colonel NAUMAN. Yes, sir. Additional commercial facilities will be developed in that area. There is a railroad spur there now and other facilities.

Mr. BLATNIK. We should have more projects like this, small in cost and with the benefit ratio fairly high.

Mr. SCHERER. This is an entirely new project?

Colonel NAUMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SCHERER. Why does it only cost $43,000 for something of this size?

Colonel NAUMAN. It involves only a small amount of dredging, Mr. Scherer.

Mrs. BLITCH. I came in late, of course, but I am wondering about the benefit-cost ratio of that, why is it just now being done?

Colonel NAUMAN. Funds were not made available until fiscal year 1957 for this study, Mrs. Blitch.

Mr. BLATNIK. Are there further questions?

(No response.)

Mr. BLATNIK. We will now hear from our colleague, Congressman Wolf, who sponsored this project.

Mr. Wolf, we have had the testimony on behalf of the Corps of Engineers on this project and we would be glad to hear from you at this time.

STATEMENT OF HON. LEONARD G. WOLF, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF IOWA

Mr. WOLF. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am happy to be here and I feel very strongly the need for this project and that is why I wanted to present my statement personally rather than submit it.

I deeply appreciate the opportunity to appear before you in behalf of this authorization. I am happy to have the Corps of Engineers supporting this project.

The Ice Harbor at the city of Dubuque is an arm of the Mississippi River 1,200 feet long by 400 feet wide. I have seen this, I looked it over, walked both banks of the Ice Harbor and I am quite familiar with it. This was created in 1872, when the citizens of the city, wishing to establish the only harbor between Quincy, Ill. and St. Paul, Minn., deeded the land to the city, which thereupon entered into a compact authorizing and empowering the United States to improve and maintain it as a harbor in perpetuity. Prior to 1928 the harbor was used as a winter mooring for Government plant engaged in river

improvement work and for that reason was dredged occasionally by the United States. No Federal dredging has been done since that time.

In 1946, it was determined that rehabilitation was necessary but no funds were available. Since that time there has been a constant silting so that depths at normal pool elevation now vary between 6 to 8 feet. The authorized Federal navigation project along this reach of river provides for a 9-foot channel and a number of harbors. Except for the 9-foot channel, there is no Federal project serving Dubuque.

The need for this project is great, Mr. Chairman. The first need is related to our national defense. I understand that under the mobilization planning survey of the Department of Defense the Dubuque Boat & Boiler Co. is scheduled to build some vessels with drafts comparatively deep. Unless the harbor is dredged, it will be unable to produce what is required by the Department of Defense. It is imperative that the dredging be done previous to M-day, so that the Dubuque Boat & Boiler Co. will not be delayed in meeting this very difficult required production schedule. At the present time this company is unable to take any boats for construction unless their draft is under 5 or 6 feet.

The Dubuque Harbor is the only natural commercial harbor on the upper Mississippi, and the Dubuque Boat & Boiler Co. offers the only repair yard on the upper Mississippi above St. Louis. Under present conditions, it is impossible to get vessels into the harbor for repairs or layup. In former years as many as 50 to 60 vessels came to the harbor for these purposes.

Mr. Chairman, due to the shallowness of the harbor, the industries of the city of Dubuque whose successful growth depends on water transportation on the Mississippi River and docking facilities at the Dubuque Harbor have had to restrict their operations.

The shallowness of the harbor is emphasized by the fact that the Coast Guard icebreaker touches bottom in the harbor.

Dubuque, with a population of 49,700, serves the commercial needs of the prosperous dairy-farming region of northeastern Iowa, northwestern Illinois, and southwestern Wisconsin. Its principal industries are based on the predominantly agricultural economy of the region. The city's main products are farm implements, meat products, fertilizers, chemical products, furniture, boats, and boilers. Sulfur and molasses are the principal items handled over the existing municipal barge terminal on the Mississippi River adjacent to the downstream side of the entrance to the harbor. Commercial and industrial developments, some with terminal and transfer facilities, occupy much of the harbor shore area. Sand and gravel are received in shallow-draft barges at a dock on the north side.

Local interests desire dredging of the harbor to depths adequate to accommodate craft using the existing Mississippi River 9-foot channel. They also desire that the Federal Government assume maintenance of the entire area. They have indicated their ability to meet the requirements of local cooperation.

The Chief of Engineers has submitted to this Congress a favorable survey report (H. Doc. 56, 86th Cong.) on this project.

If this project is approved by the Congress, Mr. Chairman, there will be many direct as well as indirect benefits to the people of the

Dubuque area. It would mean a greater volume of craft which could be repaired and altered at this point. This would mean more employment for the Dubuque area.

The dredging of the harbor would make possible the construction of a proposed set of marine ways. River operators have repeatedly pointed to the need for marine ways at the Dubuque Harbor, and there are no facilities of this nature on the whole river north of St. Louis.

The dredge material will be dumped in low spots on public property, thereby increasing the area available for industrial building.

The Government's investment in the 100- by 20-foot marginal pier and the buildings located on the depot grounds will be protected.

Dubuque Harbor is an ideal point for shipping scrap, grain, and other items and for receiving petroleum, sulfur, coal, molasses, et cetera, since the shore is served by belt or spur lines connecting with the Burlington, Milwaukee, Illinois Central, and Great Western Railroads.

The district engineer estimates the average annual benefits at $73,250, consisting of transportation savings on new movements of petroleum, scrap iron, and salt. The benefit-cost ratio is 8.83.

Mr. Chairman, river repair facilities, ship yards, and harbors are vital to river transportation and to defense in time of emergency. The harbors cannot be neglected and allowed to deteriorate, just as the locks and dams and the navigable channels cannot be allowed to deteriorate. All require constant upkeep and maintenance so that they will be available for use at all times. Neglect of any part of the river facilities cannot be overcome in a short period of time because of the vast amount of work required and the limited amounts of equipment available to do the work.

This project is endorsed by the State Natural Resources Council, the Corps of Engineers, and the Bureau of the Budget. It is also endorsed by the Mississippi Valley Association and is included in its 1959 platform.

I very much hope this committee in its wisdom will see fit to request the Congress to authorize it.

I would like to thank the chairman for the opportunity of appearing here today. If there are any specific questions I could help you with, I would be happy to attempt to answer them.

Mr. SCHERER. I was going to say this appears to be the most justified project that I have reviewed in a long time.

Mr. BLATNIK. The project comes strongly supported by the testimony presented by the corps also.

We appreciate your more detailed and supplementary statement. Thank you.

KEWAUNEE HARBOR, WIS.

Mr. BLATNIK. We will proceed to the Kewaunee Harbor in Wisconsin.

Colonel NAUMAN. Mr. Chairman, Kewaunee Harbor is located at the mouth of the Kewaunee River in Wisconsin, on the west shore of

Lake Michigan, 105 miles north of Milwaukee. Commerce on the Kewaunee consists of passenger traffic, and about a million and one hundred thousand tons of freight, of which approximately a million tons were moved by railroad car ferries. The terminal facilities consist of a slip, coal wharf, petroleum facilities, grain wharf, and shipbuilding yards and several fishing wharves.

There is an existing Federal project at Kewaunee Harbor which provides for a breakwater and shore connection with a combined length of 3,130 feet. There is authorized the removal of the outer 1,400 feet of the 1,850-foot north entrance channel pier; a south pier 1,850 feet long; and an entrance chanel 2,800 feet long and 20 feet deep leading into a turning basin with the same depth, the width of the outer 1,500 feet of channel being 525 feet, thence decreasing to 156 feet between the piers.

The plan of improvement recommended by the Chief of Engineers provides for enlarging the turning basin by removing the southerly 100 feet of Fisherman's Point to a depth of 20 feet; dredging a channel 100 feet wide, 20 feet deep, for a distance of 620 feet from the northern limit of the turning basin to the north basin; and dredging to a depth of 20 feet in the north basin over widths increasing from 100 feet in the channel to 500 feet in the north 200 feet of the basin.

Further provision is made for the elimination of the provision for removal of the outer shoal from the existing project authorization.

The total estimated cost of the project is $82,900, of which $81,900 is Federal and $1,000 is non-Federal. The ratio of benefits to cost for this project is 8.8 to 1 for the turning basin and 1.2 to 1 for the channel extension.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the transmission of this report to Congress. The State of Wisconsin is in favor of this project and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service advises that the proposed improvement would have an insignificant effect on fish and wildlife resources.

MENOMINEE HARBOR AND RIVER, WIS. AND MICH. (H. DOC. 113)

Mr. BLATNIK. The next project will be Menominee Harbor, Mich.

Colonel NAUMAN. Menominee Harbor, Mr. Chairman, is located on the west shore of Green Bay, at the mouth of the Menominee River, between the cities of Menominee, Mich., on the north bank and Marinette, Wis., on the south bank.

Industries in this area include manufacturing of mechanical and electrical equipment, chemicals, paper, furniture, cloth and wearing apparel and steel and wood boats. Commerce existing and in prospect for this project are bituminous coal, limestone, and wood pulp. Terminal facilities existing are car ferry slip and 14 wharves for handling coal, building materials and miscellaneous commodities.

The city of Marinette, Wis., has provided a public wharf. There is an existing Federal project at Menominee which provides for an entrance channel 600 feet wide and 21 feet deep from that depth in Green Bay for a distance of 2,200 feet to the outer end of the entrance piers at the mouth of the river; a channel 300 feet wide and 21 feet deep for a distance of 3,800 feet between the piers and in the river up to the Ogden Street Bridge; a channel 200 feet wide and 21 feet

deep for a distance of 4,700 feet above the bridge to the upper end of the Marinette municipal wharf; a channel generally 90 feet wide and 12 feet deep for a distance of 2,500 feet above the municipal wharf to the vicinity of the Marinette Yacht Club; and a turning basin 21 feet deep on the south side of the channel immediately below the wharf.

The plan of improvement recommended by the Chief of Engineers provides for a depth of 26 feet in the approach channel from that depth in Green Bay to a point 400 feet inside the entrance piers, thence a depth of 24 feet to the end of the existing deep-draft channel at the Marinette municipal wharf, with no change in authorized widths; and an enlargement of the existing turning basin by dredging an additional 2 acres to a depth of 21 feet.

The total estimated cost of this project is $767,000, of which $715,000 is Federal, and $52,000 is non-Federal. The ratio of benefits to cost is 1.1 to 1. The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report to Congress, and the State of Michigan and the State of Wisconsin are in favor of this project.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has no objection to this project.

That, Mr. Chairman, concludes my summary on the Menominee Harbor.

Mr. BLATNIK. Colonel, I am not quite clear on this depth. That is almost to the maximum of the new channel depth of 27 feet which you hope in a few years we will have for the entire Great Lakes system. Are those large carriers of limestone and coal that use the channel?

Colonel NAUMAN. There are some, but not the largest type. I might point out the 26-foot depth recommended is only in the entrance channel and this provides for exposure due to wave action and weather, additional clearance allowance over the 24-foot depth in the inner channel.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Why is the non-Federal contribution so small?

Colonel NAUMAN. Mr. Auchincloss, that is the estimate of cost to local interests of providing the usual requirements of local cooperation, lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary to fulfill the construction of the project.

Mr. BLATNIK. We have our colleague, Congressman Byrnes of Wisconsin with us today. Congressman, we have heard the testimony of the Corps of Engineers and the projects are recommended favorably by them, and there is no objection by the Bureau of the Budget.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN W. BYRNES, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF WISCONSIN

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your hearing me and I would like to extend my remarks at this point.

Mr. BLATNIK. Your full statement will be included in the record at this point, along with some more material; also a letter from Don W. Jirtle.

Mr. BYRNES. That is both on the Kewaunee Harbor and Menominee Harbor projects.

(The material follows:)

TESTIMONY OF REPRESENTATIVE JOHN W. BYRNES, EIGHTH DISTRICT, WISCONSIN

KEWAUNEE HARBOR, WIS.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the subcommittee to recommend the inclusion in appropriate legislation of an authorization for the work of improvement of the harbor at Kewaunee, Wis., located in my congressional district.

The Corps of Engineers has recommended that the existing harbor project at Kewaunee be improved at a cost of $82,000. This recommendation is contained in the report of the Chief of Engineers to Congress which has been printed as Senate Document 19, 86th Congress. H.R. 6157, a bill I have introduced, authorizing the improvement, is now before your committee.

I need add little to the recommendation of the Engineers concerning the need for this project and the benefit to be derived from it. The benefit ratio of extending the existing project to include the north basin is estimated at 1.2 to 1, while the benefit ratio of enlarging the turning basin is estimated at 8.8 to 1. All the evidence, I believe, shows that the improvement will produce substantial benefits to commerce and the entire area served by the port.

I would like to emphasize, however, that it is vitally necessary that the work on the harbor can be accomplished as quickly as possible. It is justified on the basis of existing commerce and the difficulty presently encountered by vessels in a harbor which is inadequate for efficient operation. The favorable report of the Chief of Engineers culminates an effort to modernize the harbor which began in 1955. The needed work is important not only to the people of Kewaunee but to the whole northeastern Wisconsin region served by the port and the shippers and carries throughout the entire Great Lakes region. Kewaunee is a vital part of an industrial and agricultural area of growing importance. It will be able to perform its vital function more efficiently and economically with the completion of the improvements recommended by the Engineers.

I urge the committee to recommend favorable action upon authorizing legislation for Kewaunee Harbor.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that you have received a telegram from the mayor of Kewaunee supporting this authorization, and I might suggest that it be included in the record at this point:

MENOMINEE HARBOR AND RIVER, MICH. AND WIS.

Mr. Chairman, I appear on behalf of the improvement of Menominee Harbor and River, Mich. and Wis.

The Menominee Harbor serves both Menominee, Mich., and Marinette, Wis. Marinette is in my congressional district. Improvement of the harbor, at an estimated cost of $715,000, has been recommended to Congress by the Chief of Engineers in House Document 113, 86th Congress. H.R. 6555, a bill I have introduced authorizing the improvement of Menominee Harbor, is now before your committee.

The Marinette-Menominee Harbor, I might point out, is one of the most important ports on northern Lake Michigan, transshiping large quantities of coal and limestone, receiving increasing shipments of pulp, serving as the terminus for the cross-lake Ann Arbor Car Ferry and giving access to increasing shipbuilding activity. It serves a constantly increasing area of Michigan and Wisconsin.

It should be emphasized that this improvement is sought on the basis of its need for present-day commerce in the harbor. Local interests were able to show at public hearings that the existing inadequate depth was causing annual losses in tonnage and dollars, amounting to as much as 100 tons per vessel. This improvement, and the Corps of Engineers so recognizes, is urgently needed to correct existing conditions. The benefits which will accrue from this improvement because of the completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway are additional reasons, of *course, for the early authorization of this project.*

I urge approval by this committee of the improvement recommended by the Engineers for Menominee Harbor and River, Mich. and Wis.

In concluding my remarks, Mr. Chairman, I would like to present to you letters from the secretary, Marinette Chamber of Commerce, and the city manager, Marinette, in support of this improvement, and I ask that they be included in the record at this point.

MENOMINEE, MICH., *May 13, 1959.*

Representative JOHN A. BLATNIK,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge your support of Menominee River Harbor project as recommended by Corps of Engineers.

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE, MENOMINEE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
A. T. GUY,
Chairman.

CITY OF MARINETTE, WIS.,
April 29, 1959.

MARINETTE-MENOMINEE HARBOR IMPROVEMENT SUPPLEMENT TO BRIEF FILED OCTOBER 25, 1955

To Chairman of Senate Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Public Works, Washington, D.C.:

I would like to respectfully submit a supplement to the brief filed at the public hearing held by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers on October 25, 1955, relative to the request for improvement of the harbor at Marinette, Wis. and Menominee, Mich. I feel it would be well at this time to add to the brief filed the following pertinent information, which not only supports but magnifies the need for a deeper harbor to handle our present water commerce.

The U.S. lake survey bulletin records reflect that in August 1952 the average lake elevation was 582.7 feet. In March 1955, the year that our report was being prepared and requested setting forth our need for a deeper harbor, the bulletin reflected an average elevation for the month of 580.98 feet, or 2.5 feet over datum. The March 1959 lake survey bulletin reports a lake average elevation of 577.9 feet or 0.6 foot below datum. This not only reflects a loss of 0.6 foot over the designed 21-foot harbor, but also a loss of 3.1 feet from March 1955 to date.

As you will note from our original report filed (p. 9), four vessels drawing 23 feet and eight vessels drawing 22 feet used our harbor during the 1953 season alone. The per inch loss of draft on boats such as the Bradley boats that service the Limestone Products Co. of Menominee reflect the usable tonnage loss of approximately 100 tons of cargo. I am quite sure that you can therefore appreciate our deep concern that we have adequate water to sufficiently service our present demands.

In closing I would therefore like to call your attention to the fact that our original request was designed around the immediate needs and demands of our harbor traffic. We have used no speculative figures as to any anticipated traffic increase, which we without a doubt will be fortunate to experience as a result of the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway. You will note from the above that the existing need is such that it is imperative that this work begin in 1960.

Respectfully,

K. W. GARDINER,
City Manager and Secretary, Marinette Harbor Commission.

CITY OF MARINETTE, WIS.,
May 12, 1959.

Re Marinette-Menominee Harbor Improvement Project.

Hon. JOHN A. BLATNIK,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors, House Public Works Committee, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am herewith attaching for your consideration an adenda to the supplement of our original brief that was prepared and filed for consideration before the Senate Public Works Subcommittee on Appropriations.

As you will note I have set forth facts relative to the present low lake level, a condition that has added to our original need for the requested harbor depth.

Bearing in mind that the harbor depth that existed at the time of the filing of our original brief in October 1955 qualified the need for additional harbor depth.

I would like at this time to further call to the attention of your honorable body the willingness of the affected communities of Marinette and Menominee as well as the State agencies of Wisconsin and Michigan to participate in the financing of a new bastille-type bridge to be constructed to replace the present swing bridge across the mouth of the inner harbor; realizing the importance of the harbor as well as the exposure to the temporary loss of use if our present swing bridge, which is in very poor condition, should become inoperative.

This new bridge project has now reached the stage that a public hearing has been set for the proposed construction of said new structure, said hearing to be held by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

I would like to further call to the attention of your honorable body that our original request of October 1955 qualified the need and demand for additional depth and harbor improvement based on the existing and recorded harbor usage, and no additional qualifications or weight were placed on the anticipated additional usage as a result of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

Respectfully submitted for your consideration.

K. W. GARDINER,
City Manager and Secretary, Marinette Harbor Commission.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN VICTOR A. KNOX (REPUBLICAN, MICHIGAN)

Mr. Chairman and subcommittee members, I wish to thank you for the opportunity to appear before you in support of an authorization for the improvement of the Menominee Harbor, Mich. and Wis., in the interest of navigation and other purposes.

Menominee Harbor is on the west shore of Green Bay at the mouth of the Menominee River, between the cities of Menominee, Mich., on the north bank and Marinette, Wis., on the south bank. This commercial harbor comprises the 2.5 mile navigable reach of the Menominee River between its mouth and a privately owned dam.

Terminal facilities are provided by local interests consisting of a municipally owned wharf in Marinette, a railroad car-ferry slip, various wharves and docks, and two boatyards.

The Menominee-Marinette area, with a population of some 61,000 is the center of diversified industrial activities; manufacturing of paper, furniture, mechanical, and electrical equipment chemicals, gloves, and wearing apparel, steel and wood boats, prefabricated dwellings, and miscellaneous wood products.

The average size of vessels in the Great Lakes service has increased in all dimensions during the past 20 years; all new ships being larger than the obsolete vessels retired from service. This fact is more in evidence now that the St. Lawrence Seaway is in operation.

A survey report on additional navigation improvements at Menominee Harbor and River was authorized by a Senate resolution adopted January 28, 1955, and by action of the House Public Works Committee adopting my resolution on June 29, 1955.

A public hearing was held on this project in Menominee, Mich., on October 25, 1955, and again at Green Bay, Wis., on February 6, 1957.

The report of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors in final response to the resolutions adopted by the Senate and House shows that improvement of the Menominee Harbor and River, Mich. and Wis., is advisable to meet the needs of prospective stone and coal commerce. It is estimated that the benefits will exceed the annual carrying charges by a ratio of 1.1 to 1.

The Board recommends modification of the existing project to provide for a depth of 26 feet in the approach channel from that depth in Green Bay to a point 400 feet inside the entrance piers, thence a depth of 24 feet to the end of the existing deep-draft channel at the Marinette municipal wharf, with no change in authorized widths; and an enlargement of the existing turning basin by dredging an additional 2 acres to a depth of 21 feet. This is generally in accordance with the plan of the District Engineer and with such modifications as the discretion of the Chief of Engineers may be advisable. The improvements are estimated to cost the United States $715,000 for construction dredging and $4,000 annually for maintenance in addition to that now required; provided that local interests agree to provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements,

and rights-of-way necessary for the construction of the project and for subsequent maintenance, when and as required. Local interests are to hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction and maintenance of the improvements and provide and maintain the depth in berthing areas adjacent to the stone and coal docks commensurate with the depths in the Federal project area.

I earnestly request that your committee give favorable consideration to these sorely needed improvements to the Menominee River Harbor and to include this project in legislation you may report to the Congress authorizing rivers and harbors projects.

MARINETTE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Marinette, Wis., May 12, 1959.

Hon. JOHN A. BLATNIK,
U.S. House of Representatives
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BLATNIK: On behalf of the Marinette Chamber of Commerce I am writing to you relative to the hearing on the Marinette-Menominee Harbor project.

Since the public hearing conducted here on October 25, 1955, by the U.S. Corps of Engineers, there has been an increasing need for the requested improvements. The records of the shipping companies which deliver cargo here will indicate they have found it necessary to carry light loads and, at times, have experienced difficulties and delays in our harbor because of the lack of sufficient water depth.

We feel it is important to point out that our requested improvements are substantiated by present-day conditions and tonnages rather than on whatever benefits may be realized from the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway.

In recent years there has been a steady growth of our industries and commerce. Because of this fortunate business growth, we have acquired 120 acres of land for an industrial park or district. Inasmuch as we no longer have any vacant buildings for prospective industry, we have found it necessary to establish a development corporation which will help provide land and buildings in our new industrial park.

Our need for harbor improvements is very real and urgent. We respectfully request your support of our needs.

Sincerely,

GEORGE S. ROBBINS, *Manager.*

KEWAUNEE, WIS., *May 12, 1959.*

Hon. JOHN A. BLATNIK,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors,
House Public Works Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have information that hearings by the House Public Works Committee are planned for Wednesday or Thursday of this week on the Kewaunee Harbor project.

As chairman of the City of Kewaunee Harbor Commission, I request favorable action by your committee thereon.

The recommended improvements by the Corps of Engineers will modernize the port of Kewaunee and permit it to take its proper place among the west-bank Lake Michigan ports.

The harbor of Kewaunee stands fourth or fifth in Wisconsin harbor tonnages. Moreover, it is an important car ferry port.

The Naph-Sol Refining Co. of Muskegon, Mich., recently established an oil terminal here.

We believe that the economic justification for the improvements requested were fully set forth in the recent hearing held before the Corps of Engineers. Moreover, it is my belief that the improvements requested are reasonable in relation to the economic benefits which would be gained by the city of Kewaunee, the State of Wisconsin, and the United States.

Consequently, we request favorable action by the committee.

Very truly yours,

DON W. JIRTLE,
Chairman, City of Kewaunee Harbor Commission.

SOUTHWEST HARBOR, MAINE

Chairman BLATNIK. We will now go to the New England, North Atlantic, and South Atlantic divisions, navigation project in Southwest Harbor, Maine.

We will first hear the Corps of Engineers' representative, Col. Stephen E. Smith, Assistant Chief, Civil Works.

STATEMENT OF COL. STEPHEN E. SMITH, ASSISTANT CHIEF, CIVIL WORKS, CORPS OF ENGINEERS, U.S. ARMY—Resumed

Colonel SMITH. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, the report on Southwest Harbor is in response to the River and Harbor Act of September 3, 1954. Southwest Harbor is on Mount Desert Island, a small island just off the coast of Maine, southeast of the city of Bangor. Bar Harbor is located on the east coast of Mount Desert Island, and Southwest Harbor is a small cove and town of the same name on the southwest coast of the island.

The island is connected to the mainland by a road. There is no existing Federal project in Southwest Harbor at the present time. The town is a fishing village, with a population of 1,650. The main industry is commercial fishing, fish processing and boatbuilding. Fish landings there in 1954 totaled 7,500 tons. There are 62 commercial fishing boats that use the harbor as a home port. In addition there are 150 transient boats that use the harbor during the fishing season. About 40,000 vessel trips are made each year.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you say 40,000?

Colonel SMITH. Yes, sir. Improvement is desired to provide more sheltered anchorages, to relieve congestion in the harbor and to eliminate delays waiting for favorable tides. Local interests have requested a 15-acre anchorage area 10 feet deep for small boats, and an 11-acre anchorage area 12 feet deep for larger boats. The Chief of Engineers recommends dredging two anchorage areas of 5 acres each, the westerly one to a depth of 6 feet, and the easterly one to a depth of 10 feet. This will meet the needs of present and prospective commerce.

The total estimated cost of this project is $271,000. The estimated Federal cost is $260,000 for construction and $2,000 annually for maintenance. The annual charges are $12,800, and annual benefits, $38,500, giving a benefit-cost ratio of 3.0.

Local interests are required to make a cash contribution of 4 percent of the construction cost, presently estimated at $11,000, to furnish all lands, easements, and rights-of-way, hold and save the United States free of damages, provide and maintain adequate public landings for the 6-foot anchorage area, and provide and maintain depths in the access channels and berthing areas, commensurate with the project depths. The State of Maine approves the project and the Bureau of the Budget has no objection to the report. That concludes my statement, sir.

Mr. BLATNIK. That is a very clear explanation of a very important harbor, even though relatively small. It is a very substantial cost-benefit ratio, and a total cost of $271,000. What was the Federal cost?

Colonel SMITH. $260,000.

Mr. BLATNIK. Any questions?

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Auchincloss.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Colonel, I understood you to say there were 40,000 fishing boats involved.

Colonel SMITH. No, sir. There are 40,000 vessel trips yer year, 40,000 round trips of a boat.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. I see.

Mr. SCHERER. What does that mean?

Colonel SMITH. A vessel trip——

Mr. BLATNIK. It means there are about 130 trips——

Mrs. BLITCH. 40,000 times boats are coming in and out.

Mr. HARGIS. Like if you go to your district 40,000 times.

Mr. SCHERER. That is about five an hour, isn't it?

Colonel SMITH. Yes, sir.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. May I ask one more question. Are those commercial fishing boats or are there pleasure craft too?

Colonel SMITH. They are mostly commercial fishing boats.

STONINGTON HARBOR, MAINE

Mr. BLATNIK. This next project was also sponsored by our colleague, Mr. McIntire, who has submitted a statement. It is Stonington Harbor, Maine.

Colonel SMITH. The report on Stonington Harbor is in response to a resolution adopted by this committee, June 27, 1956. The report was submitted to Congress by the Secretary of the Army on December 16, 1958. Stonington Harbor is on the southern tip of Deer Island, just off the coast of Maine, south of the city of Bangor, and 15 miles from Southwest Harbor, which we just discussed.

Deer Island is connected to the mainland by a highway bridge. The harbor consists of several small coves centered around the town of Stonington, with a population of 1,657. The principal industries are commercial fishing, fish processing, boatbuilding, and granite quarrying. They also act as a supply base for surrounding islands. About 14,000 tons of commerce moves through the harbor annually, involving about 70,000 vessels trips, mainly commercial fishing boats, small tankers, mail and passenger boats, barges, and a few recreational craft.

A Federal project now exists through the Deer Island Thorofare, and is the main approach to the harbor. There is no Federal project within the harbor itself. Under existing conditions, boats cannot reach their terminals at low tide, and a public landing is impractical with the present depths and boats must anchor in exposed areas.

Local interests desire five anchorage areas dredged to a depth of 8 feet. The Chief of Engineers recommends one anchorage area 8 feet deep and two anchorage areas 6 feet deep.

The estimated Federal cost of the project is $207,000 for construction, and $2,500 annually for maintenance. Annual charges are $11,800, and annual benefits $22,000, giving a benefit-cost ratio of 1.9 to 1. Local interests are required to contribute in cash 10 percent of the cost of construction, presently estimated at $23,000, furnish lands, easements, rights-of-way, hold and save the United States free from damages, and provide and maintain a public landing in Allen Cove.

The Department of Interior believes that the fishing industry will benefit from this project. The State of Maine favors the project and the Bureau of the Budget has no objection.

That concludes my statement on this project, sir.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Auchincloss.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Is this anywhere near the harbor of Islesboro, Maine? If you don't know, it is not important. It probably isn't, if you don't know.

Colonel SMITH. No, I am not familiar with that island, sir.

Mr. BLATNIK. We have the statement of Congressman Clifford G. McIntire in behalf of both the Southwest Harbor and Stonington Harbor. Congressman McIntire has discussed both of these projects with the Chair and he has submitted a very fine statement which I have read and which will be inserted in the record at this point.

(The statement is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF HON. CLIFFORD G. MCINTIRE, THIRD DISTRICT, MAINE

Mr. Chairman, I have introduced legislation designed to authorize improvements at Southwest Harbor and Stonington Harbor in Maine—H.R. 3978 and H.R. 3977.

The details related to these projects are vividly set forth in House Document No. 408, 85th Congress, 2d session, and House Document No. 36, 86th Congress, 1st session. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the U.S. Corps of Engineers on the excellence of these reports.

As the reports concerned reveal, and as this committee is so well aware, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors concurs with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in the following respects:

Southwest Harbor.—A two-anchorage area for small craft, the total first cost being $280,000, including $250,000 for Federal dredging and $30,000 for local pier construction and dredging. Annual carrying charges would be $12,100, of which $10,800 would be Federal, including $2,000 maintenance, and $1,200 would be local, including $200 for maintenance. Owing to the general relationship between general and local benefits, no local contribution for pier construction and dredging costs is required. The benefit-cost ratio is 3.0.

Stonington Harbor.—Three separate anchorages, the estimated cost of the plan being $220,000, of which $198,000 would be Federal and $22,000 local. Local interests would also provide $14,000 for two public landings. Annual charges would be $10,300, including $2,500 for Federal maintenance. The benefit-cost ratio is 2.0.

Mr. Chairman, the State of Maine is unique in many respects, and one of the characteristics contributing to its uniqueness is the multiplicity of small seaport towns that grace its rugged coastline.

These communities have sprung into existence because of the sea, and born of the sea, they live by the sea. Because the sea is their destiny, they are sometimes referred to as "the children of the waters."

Small fishing craft are, in effect, the lifeline of these sea-dependent communities, vessels that ply the choppy waters of the Atlantic in quest of the marine life harbored in its depths.

These lifelines must be kept clear, else these communities will perish, and this condition can be arrived at only through the development of harbors that will permit safe passage and adequate accommodation for these all-important vessels.

A harbor has the same vital relationship to a seaport town as does a highway system to an inland community. Each of us is familiar with the important part that highways play in the life of such inland communities, for, in effect, they are the arteries through which course the community's lifeblood of commerce. In a like manner does a harbor contribute to the economic health of a small seacoast village, for it is the vital link between the community and the sea from which it draws its sustenance.

The inhabitants of these communities live in the shadows of the waves, and as the sea is strong, so are the people hearty—in their physique and in their enterprise.

Mr. Chairman, the seacoast man is truly a rugged individualist, a man who invests from $3,000 to $5,000 in a vessel in order to go forth and cope with the sea. His boat, his fishing gear, his efforts—in fact, all that he uses in his industry belongs to him, and here, in effect, is a striking example of individual enterprise.

Harbor improvements, such as are recommended by the Chief of Engineers for Southwest and Stonington Harbors in Maine, would permit the fisherman to deal with the sea on terms more equal than those with which he presently is confronted. These improvements would serve to safeguard not only the fisherman's life but his boat which represents a substantial portion of lifetime savings.

And in a like manner, these improvements would make a material contribution to the economic welfare of the communities associated with the harbors concerned, for as in the case of Southwest Harbor, the annual benefits are estimated at $35,900, consisting of $24,000 from additional fish catch, $10,200 from elimination of boat damages, and $1,700 from recreational boating.

And for Stonington Harbor, the division engineer estimates the benefits at $20,100, consisting of $5,000 in reduced boat damages, $11,300 in reduced fishing and other commercial boat operation costs, $2,000 in savings from service as a harbor of refuge, and $1,800 in increased recreational boating benefits.

Mr. Chairman, the projects concerned have been submitted to critical and objective examination by the U.S. Corps of Engineers, and the substance of the resultant reports undeniably supports the theme of harbor improvements at Southwest Harbor and Stonington Harbor in Maine. Because of this, I respectfully urge that this committee give favorable consideration to my legislation—H.R. 3978 and H.R. 3977.

Mr. Chairman, I deeply appreciate having the opportunity of presenting my testimony to this committee.

MORICHES AND SHINNECOCK INLETS, N.Y.

Mr. BLATNIK. The next project is Moriches and Shinnecock Inlets, N.Y.

Colonel SMITH. The report on this project is in response to section 6 of the River and Harbor Act of March 2, 1945. The report was submitted to Congress by the Secretary of the Army on February 20, 1959.

Moriches and Shinnecock Inlets are the easternmost of five openings through the narrow, sandy barrier beach on the south shore of Long Island which separates the Atlantic Ocean from a series of interconnected bays. These two inlets are 15 miles apart and are 80 and 95 miles, respectively, by water from the Battery in New York City.

Local interests have dredged channels through these two inlets; they have revetted the banks and constructed revetments in the Atlantic Ocean to protect the inlets; and dredged channels from each inlet to the Long Island Intracoastal Waterway.

In 1943 the Corps of Engineers dredged channels 6 feet deep and 100 feet wide from the north end of each inlet to the Long Island Intracoastal Waterway for the U.S. Navy. However, the inlets are not stabilized, and the revetments and jetties have been damaged by storms and the bay and inlet channels have shoaled, so they are not usable except to very small vessels during high tides.

The only Federal project in the area is the Long Island Intracoastal Waterway. Local interests desire stabilization of each inlet and a channel from the ocean through each inlet to the Long Island Intracoastal Waterway, in order to assure dependable navigation routes, improved tidal flows in the basin for beach erosion control.

The Chief of Engineers recommends stabilization of each inlet by rehabilitation of the existing revetments and jetties, extension of existing jetties, provision of sand bypassing facilities, entrance channels

through the inlet 10 feet deep and 200 feet wide, and inner channels 6 feet deep and 100 feet wide to the Intracoastal Waterway.

Estimated Federal cost is $7,370,000 for construction and $215,300 annually for maintenance. Annual charges are $856,400, and annual benefits are $1,641,000, giving a benefit-cost ratio of 1.9 to 1.

Local interests are required to contribute in cash 45 percent of the cost of construction at Moriches Inlet, presently estimated at $2,929,000, and to contribute in cash 37 percent of the cost of construction at Shinnecock Inlet, presently estimated at $2,226,000. They also are required to contribute 50 percent of the cost of maintenance, operation, and replacement at Moriches, presently estimated at $93,000 annually, and to contribute 38 percent of the cost of maintenance, operation, and replacement at Shinnecock Inlet presently estimated at $71,000 annually. They must comply with the usual requirements of local cooperation, and in addition they must maintain continued public ownership of the publicly owned shores and continued availability for public use of privately owned shores upon which a portion of the Federal share of the cost is based.

The project is favored by the State of New York. The Department of Interior, U.S. Public Health Service, and the Bureau of the Budget have no objection to the report.

That is all, sir.

Mr. McFall (presiding). Are there any questions?

Mr. Burke. Colonel, from what do these benefits flow in this area? Is there much commercial activity on that part of the island?

Colonel Smith. There is very little commercial traffic at the present time, because vessels cannot get out into the Atlantic Ocean to fish. In order to get into the ocean from this area, they have to go down to the next inlet, and it is just too long a journey. But the summary of the benefits shows that fishing wil benefit from it, as well as recreation boats, and we also get benefits from beach erosion control and anti-pollution in both of the bays.

Mr. Burke. Isn't that principally a recreational area now?

Colonel Smith. The area in general is primarily recreational, yes. yes.

Mr. Burke. Thank you.

Mr. McFall. Is there any history on this, Colonel Smith? Has it been up before, or do you know if you have had any problems with this before?

Colonel Smith. These inlets did not exist until the early thirties, when they were broken through by storms from the Atlantic. And this report is in response to the act approved in 1945. I do not believe there was any Federal action before that time.

Mr. McFall. The next project is Shem Creek, S.C. Colonel Smith will also explain this one.

SHEM CREEK, S.C.

Colonel Smith. The report on Shem Creek is in response to the Rivers and Harbors Act of July 24, 1946. This report was submitted to Congress by the Secretary of the Army on December 16, 1958. Shem Creek is in the harbor of Charleston, S.C. It is a small tidal tributary, about 2 miles long entering the lower harbor from the northwest. It is a base for all commercial fishing vessels in the

Charleston area. About 50 trawlers operate out of the area and serve eight seafood processing and shipping plants located on the banks of Shem Creek. The existing authorized project provides for a channel 10 feet deep and 110 feet wide, extending up Shem Creek to the Mount Pleasant public wharf, with a turning basin 130 by 400 feet at the end.

Local interests desire that the channel be extended upstream 1,150 feet, to U.S. Highway 17. This improvement was actually constructed by the Federal Government in 1954, under section 3 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of March 2, 1945, at a Federal cost of $6,902, and a non-Federal contribution of $2,500. The purpose of this authorization is to provide for maintenance only.

The Chief of Engineers recommends maintenance of this channel in Shem Creek upstream from the head of the existing project to Highway 17, and in addition, recommends maintenance of a channel 10 feet deep and 90 feet wide in Hog Island Channel from Shem Creek to the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway. Hog Island Channel is a natural channel but it now requires periodic maintenance to maintain the depth of 10 feet. The first cost of this project is zero. The annual Federal cost is $3,000 for maintenance, and annual charges are estimated at $3,530; annual benefits, $11,250. This gives a cost-benefit ratio of 3.2 to 1. Local interests are required to provide spoil disposal areas, hold and save the United States free from damages, and furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that they will continue to provide and maintain public landings facilities at least equivalent to those now existing.

The Department of Interior is of the opinion the project will benefit the fishing industry. The State of South Carolina is favorable and the Bureau of the Budget has no objection to the project.

That concludes my statement, sir.

Mr. BLATNIK (presiding). Thank you, Colonel. Are there any questions?

(No response.)

Mr. BLATNIK. That completes our projects for this morning's hearing.

Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. BLATNIK. On the record.

We will adjourn the public hearings for today and the committee will go into executive session to consider several navigation resolutions at this time.

(Whereupon, at 11:05 a.m. the hearing was adjourned, to reconvene at 10 a.m. Thursday, May 14, 1959.)

RIVER AND HARBOR AND FLOOD CONTROL OMNIBUS BILL, 1959

THURSDAY, MAY 14, 1959

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to adjournment, at 10 a.m. in room 1302, New House Office Building, Hon. John A. Blatnik, presiding.

Mr. BLATNIK. The Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee of the House committee will please come to order.

We are resuming public hearings on various bills and projects pertaining to rivers and harbors. This morning we will start off with a general statement and then more specific presentations on the improvements to the Great Lakes harbors as related to the St. Lawrence Seaway and Great Lakes connecting channels.

GREAT LAKES HARBORS

Mr. BLATNIK. Colonel Nauman, will you present your introductory statement on the Great Lakes harbors. We hope, and I think shall be able to treat all these harbors on the Great Lakes as related to the St. Lawrence Seaway and connecting channels in a group, or en bloc. The nature of the work and the purpose of the work is similar, if not identical, in all cases. Will you proceed, Colonel.

STATEMENT OF COL. ARTHUR C. NAUMAN, ASSISTANT CHIEF OF PUBLIC WORKS, CORPS OF ENGINEERS, U.S. ARMY—Resumed

Colonel NAUMAN. Mr. Chairman, resolutions by the Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate, adopted May 18, 1956, and the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives of the United States, adopted June 27, 1956, requested the review of the reports of the Chief of Engineers on the Great Lakes connecting channels published as Senate Document No. 71, 84th Congress, and other reports with a view to determining the advisability of further improvements of the harbors on the Great Lakes in the interest of present and prospective deep-draft commerce with due regard to the scheduled time of completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway and the connecting channels of the Great Lakes.

In response to these resolutions, a comprehensive survey of the harbors of the Great Lakes was undertaken. Considerable time will be required to complete all traffic analyses and engineering studies in order to determine the improvements which are economically justified at

individual harbors involved in the comprehensive study. Therefore, it was determined that interim reports should be processed as early as practicable on harbors or portions of harbors for which all necessary information could be developed at an early date. By following this procedure, it has been possible to submit reports on advisable navigation improvements for certain bulk commodity commerce which will take advantage of the 27-foot controlling depth being provided in the Great Lakes connecting channels and in the St. Lawrence Seaway. The submission of these interim reports will in no way adversely affect consideration subsequently given for additional improvements for other waterborne commerce in these harbors in later reports.

In addition to the reports that have been completed, it is expected that about 20 additional interim reports will be prepared before the final comprehensive report is completed and transmitted to Congress.

In the survey report on the connecting channels (S. Doc. No. 71, 84th Cong.), it was recognized that the potential benefits for deepening the connecting channels would not be realized unless harbors sufficient to accommodate the prospective commerce were also deepened and the terminals improved. Commerce for which transportation savings were estimated in that report was limited to iron ore, stone, and grain. It was determined in that report there was adequate economic justification for deepening both the channels and the harbors to accommodate the prospective commerce. The economic analysis in Senate Document No. 71, 84th Congress, showed an overall benefit-cost ratio of 1.78 to 1 for the channels and harbor system and was based on the improvement to provide for a controlling depth of 27 feet for the channels and 20 harbors. The benefits consisted of transportation savings on 88,300,000 tons of future annual commerce in iron ore, stone, and grain. The benefits were prorated between the connecting channels and harbors in proportion to the respective annual carrying charges resulting in 77 percent assigned to the channels and 23 percent to the harbors.

At this time, the Chief of Engineers has completed 12 interim reports. Three of these reports are with Congress and seven are in process to Congress. The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of these 10 reports to Congress. In addition, there are two other reports which are presently with the Bureau of the Budget. All 12 of these reports are economically justified.

Mr. Chairman, I have a list of these harbors, which I could read at this time or merely insert in the record whichever you wish.

Mr. BLATNIK. Will you read them, please?

Colonel NAUMAN. The reports that are with Congress are the following: Presque Isle, Mich.; Sandusky, Ohio: and Two Harbors, Minn. Reports in process to Congress are: Ashtabula, Ohio; Buffalo, N.Y.; Calumet, Ill., and Ind.; Cleveland, Ohio; Dul-Superior, Minn. and Wis.; Marquette, Mich.; and Toledo, Ohio. Reports with the Bureau of the Budget: Ashland, Wis., and Lorain, Ohio.

Mr. BLATNIK. At this point we will include the further data on these projects, showing the costs broken down as to Federal cost, non-Federal cost, and total cost, with the benefit-cost ratio of each.

(The document mentioned is as follows:)

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Two Harbors, Minn.:			
Cost	$162,000	$46,000	$208,000
Annual charges		$8,000	
Annual benefits		$543,000	
Benefit-cost ratio		68.0	
Duluth-Superior Harbor, Minn. and Wis.:			
Cost	$2,364,000	$172,500	$2,536,000
Annual charges		$91,800	
Annual benefits		$1,775,000	
Benefit-cost ratio		19.3	
Ashland Harbor, Wis.:			
Cost	$1,495,000	$207,500	$1,702,500
Annual charges		$65,400	
Annual benefits		$168,800	
Benefit-cost ratio		2.6	
Presque Isle Harbor, Mich.:			
Cost	$215,300	$23,000	$238,300
Annual charges		$8,930	
Annual benefits		$230,800	
Benefit-cost ratio		25.8	
Marquette Harbor, Mich.:			
Cost	$236,000	$12,000	$248,000
Annual charges		$9,200	
Annual benefits		$23,700	
Benefit-cost ratio		2.6	
Calumet Harbor, Ill. and Ind.:			
Cost	$5,240,000	$5,000	$5,245,000
Annual charges		$192,400	
Annual benefits		$1,328,500	
Benefit-cost ratio		6.9	
Toledo Harbor, Ohio:			
Cost	$14,684,000	$1,320,000	$16,004,000
Annual charges		$601,100	
Annual benefits		$668,000	
Benefit-cost ratio		1.1	
Sandusky Harbor, Ohio:			
Cost	$5,800,000	$428,000	$6,228,000
Annual charges		$263,900	
Annual benefits		$1,006,500	
Benefit-cost ratio		3.8	
Cleveland Harbor, Ohio:			
Cost	$2,486,000	$2,869,500	$5,355,500
Annual charges		$272,300	
Annual benefits		$1,235,700	
Benefit-cost ratio		4.5	
Lorain Harbor, Ohio:			
Cost	$19,323,000	$2,455,000	$21,778,000
Annual charges		$881,300	
Annual benefits		$1,226,700	
Benefit-cost ratio		1.4	
Ashtabula Harbor, Ohio:			
Cost	$4,077,000	$980,000	$5,057,000
Annual charges		$210,400	
Annual benefits		$877,900	
Benefit-cost ratio		4.2	
Buffalo Harbor, N.Y.:			
Cost	$2,352,000	$1,248,000	$3,600,000
Annual charges		$180,000	
Annual benefits		$725,000	
Benefit-cost ratio		4.0	

Colonel NAUMAN. The range is total cost is from $208,000 to $21,778,000, and the ratio of benefits to costs is from 1.1 to 68.0 to 1.0.

Mr. BLATNIK. At this point would you tell us which harbor has the 68-to-1 benefit-cost ratio?

Colonel NAUMAN. Mr. Chairman, the harbor with that ratio is Two Harbors, Minn.

Mr. BLATNIK. Those are iron ore shipping ports, about 20-some miles northeast of Duluth on the north shore of Lake Superior. I think that is an all-time-high record; I am very proud of it.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. May I say something, Mr. Chairman, off the record?

Mr. BLATNIK. Yes.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. BLATNIK. On the record. Will you proceed, please, Colonel.

Colonel NAUMAN. The improvements recommended by the Chief of Engineers for each of these harbors will permit accommodation of vessels utilizing the improved connecting channels.

In the case of each of the 12 reports, the benefits are generally transportation savings on iron ore, stone, grain, coal, and in some cases, reduction of vessel and dock damage. It was recognized in the report on the connecting channels that benefits would accrue to these channels only if the shipping and receiving harbors on the Great Lakes were appropriately deepened, so a portion of the benefits developed for the connecting channels was set aside to provide for deepening the Great Lakes harbors. Therefore, the unit transportation savings developed and utilized for the connecting channels is applied to the commerce at the shipping and receiving harbors. This is presently evaluated as 14 cents per ton, of which 4.7 cents per ton is assigned to shipping harbors and 9.3 cents per ton to receiving harbors.

That, Mr. Chairman, concludes my general statement on the 12 interim reports covering the Great Lakes harbors which have been processed by the Chief of Engineers.

Mr. BLATNIK. Are there any questions?

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Can you give us in general terms how the non-Federal contributions worked out on these, because it seems to me that a project like Sandusky, Ohio, where the Federal cost is $5,800,000, that the non-Federal contribution might easily be more than only $428,000.

Colonel NAUMAN. The non-Federal costs, Mr. Auchincloss, are not a contribution. They represent an estimate of the cost of local interests to provide the requirements of local cooperation in the way of lands, easements, rights-of-way, and providing the facilities needed to utilize the improved channels. The Federal cost is attributable to improving the project where general benefits will accrue, outside of the limits of the docking area and up to the Federal harbor line only.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. In other words, as I understand what you said, Federal costs represent cold cash?

Colonel NAUMAN. Yes, sir. Well——

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. The non-Federal costs represent some cash, but a lot of the contribution is services and so forth?

Colonel NAUMAN. No, sir; it requires an outlay of the same kind of cash to accomplish the work necessary for local interests to be able to utilize the project.

Mr. BLATNIK. Colonel, on this same point, your non-Federal costs do not include the new terminal facilities now under construction or being planned for construction in several of these harbors, do they? We understand in Chicago there is a considerable program underway providing for storage of grain and grain terminals. In the Duluth-Superior Harbor we have a $10 million State-municipal-public terminal. Would that be included in the non-Federal cost in the categories of terminal facilities?

Colonel NAUMAN. No, sir; those are self-liquidating installations and are not considered a nonrecoverable required outlay to utilize the improved harbors.

Mr. BLATNIK. Any further questions?

(No response.)

Do any of the members want a description of any of the particular harbors, especially some of the larger harbors, as to the nature of the work?

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Chairman, if I may, I would like to ask the colonel if he would submit for the record the breakdown of the non-Federal contribution in each one of these projects.

Colonel NAUMAN. Yes, sir; I will.

(The breakdown is as follows:)

Harbor	*Non-Federal cost*
1. Presque Isle, Mich.: Dredging berthing areas adjacent to docks	$23,000
2. Sandusky, Ohio: Dredging berthing areas adjacent to coal docks and access thereto from Federal improvement	428,000
3. Two Harbors, Minn.: Dredging berthing areas adjacent to docks	46,000
4. Ashtabula, Ohio: Dredging slips to and berthing areas at docks	980,000
5. Buffalo, N.Y.: Dredging berthing areas and slips to docks and piers	1,248,000
6. Ashland, Wis.: Deepening slip and access channels	207,500
7. Calumet, Ill. and Ind.: Dockside dredging	5,000
8. Cleveland, Ohio: Dredging berthing areas and bulkhead reconstruction	2,869,500
9. Duluth-Superior, Minn. and Wis.: Dredging berthing areas at piers	172,500
10. Lorain, Ohio: Dredging berthing areas, dock and bulkhead modifications, and transmission line relocations	2,455,000
11. Marquette, Mich.: Dredging berthing areas	12,000
12. Toledo, Ohio: Dredging dock approaches and strengthening docks	1,320,000

Mr. BLATNIK. Colonel, can you explain, since many of these harbors are quite similar in geographic layout along the Great Lakes shoreline, why some of the harbors, such as Lorain, Ohio, which has a high cost of $21.8 million, and Toledo, Ohio, $16 million, why those costs are so high compared to the average, which runs only from $2 million to $5 or $6 million? These costs are two to three or four times as high.

Colonel NAUMAN. Mr. Chairman, with the exception of Lorain, it is generally a variation of dredging quantities. Toledo is in the shallow end of Lake Erie, and, in addition to the deepening in the existing Federal project, by deepening the entrance channel we necessarily extend the channel farther out into Lake Erie and run into rather large quantities of dredging.

In the case of Lorain, a large portion of the cost is a result of necessary breakwater construction, additional breakwater construction, to properly shelter the entrance channel. With that exception, so far in these 12 harbors it is simply a variation of quantities in dredging.

Lake Superior, for instance, is in a natural defile between low mountain ranges, and the harbors are on rather steep slopes and the entrance channels are quite natural, and you don't run into any dredging getting away from shore out into deep water.

Mr. BLATNIK. Colonel, is there any time requirement that goes along with these projects, since they are related quite directly to the deepening of the channels in the Great Lakes to 27 feet, the work which is now underway?

Colonel NAUMAN. The timing is related to the connecting channels, in that full benefits of the connecting channels improvement will not be realized until shipping and receiving harbors are deepened to

accommodate the vessels that will be able to be loaded to 25½ feet, safe draft at low water, some time during the calendar year of 1962.

Mr. BLATNIK. Would you repeat that last part? Did you say the program will be completed by 1962?

Colonel NAUMAN. It will not be completed, Mr. Chairman, but the channels will be sufficiently improved that vessels will be able to load to the 25½ safe draft at low water some time during the calendar year 1962, in accordance with our present construction schedule. Of course, the St. Lawrence Seaway will be having vessels transiting it something on the order of 25-foot safe draft this year, during the month of June.

Mr. BLATNIK. What is the estimated completion date for the channel-deepening project according to your schedule now?

Colonel NAUMAN. Full completion, which includes anchorage areas and open-water shoal areas, 1964 or 1965, of course subject to future appropriations.

Mr. BLATNIK. Do you have any time estimate—assuming these 12 harbors are authorized this year and money not appropriated until next year, which would be fiscal 1961—do you have any time estimate on completion time required for these harbors?

Colonel NAUMAN. The harbors we are discussing this morning, the construction time would vary from 1 to 3 years.

Mr. BLATNIK. A fact not too well understood even by people around the Great Lakes area is that even though the channel-deepening project is now underway, it will be perhaps 5 or 6 years before it is completed, and it is not well known that just because of the St. Lawrence Seaway giving a deeper draft, that suddenly it is possible for ocean-going vessels and Great Lakes vessels to utilize to a greater potential the facilities on the Great Lakes. The St. Lawrence Channel, the old canals, were a 14-foot depth, if I recall correctly. Is that correct?

Colonel NAUMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLATNIK. And the normal, average vessel draft is 13 feet. The existing channels on the Great Lakes are 22 feet upbound and 25 feet downbound, so at once large vessels can use the existing channels down to around the 21-foot draft. Is that correct?

Colonel NAUMAN. Of course, the downbound drafts vary seasonally, and 21 downbound would be about the minimum expected draft during low water, when water is extremely low.

Mr. BLATNIK. I was thinking of the upbound draft, vessels coming in loaded.

Colonel NAUMAN. That is presently limited to drafts on the order of 19 feet, to go through the 21-foot channels. However, some time, perhaps the end of this year, by the end of the navigation season, upbound vessels will be able to load to 25 feet; the westerly half of the upbound channel in the Detroit River will be deepened by that time.

Mr. BLATNIK. The 25-foot draft extends all the way up to the western end of the Great Lakes, Duluth and Superior?

Colonel NAUMAN. About a year later, for the St. Mary's River.

Mr. BLATNIK. Any further questions?

(No response.)

Mr. BLATNIK. Thank you very much, Colonel.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. May I just ask one more question?

Mr. BLATNIK. Yes.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Could you give us a rough estimate when we may receive the interim reports of the balance of the projects? I mean, would that be a year or 6 months?

Colonel NAUMAN. There are additional ones in process now, Mr. Auchincloss.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. I think it would be all right if you put it in the record later.

Colonel NAUMAN. I would be glad to. I might say at this point we have eight more scheduled to be processed in the Office of the Chief of Engineers before the end of this fiscal year. I will put the complete estimate of the submission of the balance of the reports in the record at this point.

(The document mentioned is as follows:)

Interim reports scheduled for submission to Congress

Number of reports:	*Schedule date for submission to Congress*	Number of reports—Con.	*Schedule date for submission to Congress*
3	August 1959.	3	August 1960.
5	January 1960.	3	September 1960.
1	March 1960.	3	December 1960.
2	April 1960.	4	January 1961.
2	June 1960.	2	July 1961.

Mr. BLATNIK. Thank you very much, Colonel.

Congressman A. D. Baumhart of Ohio will be next with statements concerning the Sandusky and Lorain, Ohio projects.

STATEMENT OF HON. ALBERT D. BAUMHART, JR., A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF OHIO

Mr. BAUMHART. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am very happy to appear before this distinguished committee today, to ask for approval of one of the public works projects important not only to my congressional district, but to the State of Ohio, and our entire country as well.

This project results, of course, from the study that has been made by the Corps of Engineers with favorable recommendations for its construction.

Shortly after I became a Member of Congress, I attended a meeting of the Sandusky Port Committee in February of 1955, where we discussed matters pertaining to this project. I was orally requested during that meeting to introduce a resolution before the House Committee on Public Works to authorize the survey of the port facilities at Sandusky.

I requested the House Committee on Public Works to pass a resolution, which requested the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors to review House Document 584 of the 69th Congress, 2d session, to determine the feasibility of deepening the Sandusky Harbor to 27 feet. This resolution was adopted on June 29, 1955.

Public hearings were held in Sandusky, Ohio, on January 24, 1956. All interested parties testified upon this occasion.

On May 18, 1956, the Senate Public Works Committee and the House Public Works Committee on June 27, 1956, both adopted resolutions requesting the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors to review the reports of the Chief of Engineers on the Great Lakes con-

necting channels (published as S. Doc. 71, 84th Cong.), with a view to determining the advisability of further improvements of the harbors on the Great Lakes in the interest of present and prospective deep-draft commerce, with due regard to the scheduled time of completion of the St. Lawrence seaway and the connecting channels between the Great Lakes. Congress subsequently appropriated funds for this overall study.

Following adoption of this resolution, the U.S. Corps of Engineers issued an interim report on Sandusky. This report recommended deepening of the channel and certain other improvements in Sandusky Harbor, and estimated that the cost of such construction would be $5,510,000.

Another interim report was issued on September 3, 1958, announcing that revisions had been made to the February 14 report. The reporting officer recommended additional improvements to the Sandusky Harbor and stated that the estimated cost of the additional work now brought the total estimate for construction up to $5,800,000.

Improvement of Sandusky Harbor, Ohio, is advisable to meet the needs of prospective coal commerce. It is estimated that the average annual benefits will exceed the annual carrying charges by a ratio of 3.8 to 1. I know that the increase in the size of ships and particularly in the amount of coal transportation since the harbor was last improved in 1933, certainly justifies the comparatively small appropriation needed at this time.

Cost of construction to the United States is estimated at $5,800,000, providing local interests agree to certain conditions. The conditions will, of course, be gladly met, and such action is presently under way.

I have been advised also that the Bureau has reported favorably on this project.

The urgent need for this improvement, in my opinion, stems partially from the fact that large ships now being used, and being constructed for use on the St. Lawrence Seaway traffic, cannot be loaded or unloaded in Sandusky Harbor due to the insufficient depth of the harbor channel, and limited turnaround facilities.

While I do not claim to be an expert on matters of shipping and harbor facilities, I have been in continuous consultation over a long period of time with most of the major shipping and dock companies who use Sandusky Harbor, such as the Pennsylvania Railroad, Lower Lake Dock Co., and members of the Lake Carriers Association.

As a consequence of this consultation and study, I am advised that Sandusky Harbor depth in the bay channel is limited to 21 feet. The depth of the water fluctuates to such an extent that at times it is impossible to load any of our present-day vessels to a depth beyond 18 feet 6 inches.

In considering the justification for this improvement from an economic standpoint, it should be borne in mind that Sandusky is one of the major coal-loading ports on the Great Lakes. These coal-loading machines, located on three separate docks, represent a substantial investment. These machines, during the year 1955, loaded 8 million tons of coal. They have a capacity of 20 million tons per year, and in view of the projected increase of production of heavy industries in the United States over the next 50 years, and the strategic location of Sandusky Harbor in an area which is increasing industrially at a rate in

excess of the average growth of other communities, there is every indication of continued heavy shipments of coal out of this harbor, and a substantial increase in numerous other commodities, such as sand, gravel, crushed rock, and limestone.

Our present-day ships exceed 700 feet in length and we have every reason to believe ships of the future will be longer, and of deeper draft. It is difficult to estimate the amount of tonnage which will be lost to the port of Sandusky in the future unless harbor facilities are deepened.

Further, the present turning basin is approximately 800 feet wide. There is a dock dike at the western extremity of the dock channel. Since some of our vessels today are up to 714 feet in length, they have encountered considerable difficulty and much lost time in making this turn.

Presently the bay channel is used only by outbound deep-draft vessels. Widening and deepening it, as recommended, would give Sandusky Harbor a channel which could be utilized as a two-way channel—that if, for incoming deep-draft vessels, as well as outgoing deep-draft vessels. This improvement would give a direct approach to ships, save time, and minimize the chances of collision or damage to all ships and other craft.

Sandusky Harbor has the advantage, too, of being one of the two natural landlocked harbors on Lake Erie, and the protection offered by Sandusky Bay makes possible the ultimate use of the entire port and harbor facilities during the entire shipping season. The fact that it is a protected harbor makes it an extremely desirable port for wintering vessels.

I would also like to call your attention to the fact that the port facilities of the city of Sandusky, and the availability of railroad and highway service, serving a highly industrialized area, will derive substantial new commerce from the St. Lawrence Seaway. As a consequence of this, the State of Ohio, as well as the entire country, will reap great benefits from these recommended improvements.

In view of the favorable report of the U.S. Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of the Budget, and the significant fact that local interests themselves have expended more than $5 million already for improvement and maintenance of the harbor (excluding items of required local cooperation), I urge that this committee recommend this project to be incorporated in the legislation presently pending before you.

Mr. BLATNIK. Did you have any statement on Lorain Harbor project?

Mr. BAUMHART. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

On January 24, 1955, I introduced the Lorain Harbor survey resolution which was referred to the House Committee on Public Works. This was done with full knowledge of the pressing need for improvements to that harbor. This resolution was adopted on June 29, 1955.

An earlier resolution is on record for this project, which was adopted on August 2, 1946, by the then House Committee on Rivers and Harbors. This resolution requested the Board of Engineers to review reports on Lorain Harbor, with a view to determining the advisability of modifying the existing project at that time. Such improvements were not recommended then, but the economic picture has changed and the need for improvements to Lorain Harbor since that time have become increasingly evident.

It is obvious that there is a great potential in the St. Lawrence Seaway project. If this is to be capitalized upon to the utmost, immediate steps must be taken to improve the harbors of the Great Lakes. It is with this thought in mind that I come before you today to ask that Lorain Harbor be included among those harbors being considered by this committee for authorization and eventual approval.

Public hearings were held at Lorain, Ohio, on October 18, 1955, and again on November 20, 1956. Testimony was presented at that time by the mayors of both Lorain and Elyria, various city officials, leading businessmen and representatives of shipping and other industries.

The October 18 hearings were limited primarily to further modifications in order to improve the outer harbor, provide a safer entrance, reduce wave action in the harbor and along the shore easterly of the river mouth, and to provide additional anchorage area in the outer harbor.

The November 20 hearings were for the purpose of considering improvements of Lorain Harbor in the interest of deep-draft bulk commerce.

Lorain Harbor is primarily a receiving port for iron ore and limestone and a shipping port for bituminous coal. From a low of 6,442,070 tons of iron ore in 1949, shipments have increased by 1951 to 8,299,290 tons. Limestone receipts have run almost 1 million tons a year. Coal shipments have increased from a low of 2,480,986 tons in 1949 to over 3 million tons in both 1950 and 1951. Major increases have been experienced since these days. Due to the projected increase of production by heavy industries in the United States over the next 50 years, there is every indication that there will be continued heavy receipts of iron ore, and increasing shipments of limestone and outgoing coal.

We desire to make Lorain Harbor safe for the lake freighters of today, and to allow for the future growth of its commerce as may result from the St. Lawrence Seaway development.

Many instances of damage to vessels entering Lorain Harbor have occurred, caused by striking either the breakwater, one of the piers, or the B. & O. docks.

A record is available covering a 6 year period from 1948 to 1953. At least 23 instances are reported where ships were damaged entering this harbor. Bureau of Labor Statistics reports the average cost increase of construction has risen from 100 percent from 1946 to 194.27 percent through 1955. Damages for this 6-year period, including ship time lost because of these accidents, totaled $811,141 (at 1955 cost levels). An average benefit of $135,190 per year due to elimination of damage can thus be expected. Estimates place damages to the breakwater, entrance lighthouse and B. & O. docks at an average of over $5,000 per year.

Many ships scheduled for Lorain frequently have had to be diverted to other ports with more adequate protection. Occasionally ships have had to wait out a storm until conditions moderated sufficiently for a safe entrance to be negotiated. In either case, losses have occurred, both to shipowners and operators of docks in Lorain. The reduction or elimination of delays to vessels waiting for safe entry should benefit Lorain Harbor in the amount of almost $40,000 per year.

Adding all cumulative losses caused by delays in loading coal on vessels, it has been estimated that a total annual loss of at least $15,500 resulted.

Interruption of work at the B. & O. ore and coal docks, due to wave action on ships loading or unloading during storms in the outer harbor, caused a loss in ship time and dock operations for the 3-year period between 1951 through 1953 of $13,408, or an average annual loss of $4,469.

The breakwater system at Lorain was originally designed in 1895 for use by the 300- to 400-foot-long freighters of that day. Breakwaters at Lorain Harbor are not adequate for present shipping.

Twenty years ago as many as 29 vessels formerly wintered in Lorain Harbor. The situation has changed drastically, however, due to the fact that ships are so much larger and some of the old mooring spots are not suitable for the larger ships of today. It is felt that protection and enlargement of the outer harbor (including making available more berthing space in the outer harbor), would result in a benefit of $230,400.

The importance of Lorain ship repair facilities is clearly shown by the size of average jobs there as compared with other plants. Lorain has an average of $85,000, Toledo an average of $65,000, and Buffalo an average of $20,000.

The first section of the east breakwater was constructed in 1908, and extended in 1951 to its present length of 2,300 feet. Since that time the shore has eroded over 150 feet, and all the piers, walls, and jetties originally built by local interests for protection in this area have been washed away. In 1952, after repeated petitions by the U.S. Coast Guard, the city of Lorain built at its own expense a wall to protect that station. In 1953 this wall was extended to include the new municipal sewage treatment plant. Lorain has invested, for these two walls, the sum of $264,021.30. Since this area is so exposed to northeast storms, the lifespan of this wall is estimated to be only 10 years. If the present inadequate wall is washed out by another severe northeast storm, the city of Lorain will be faced with another expenditure of possibly $300,000 by 1962. An annual benefit of $30,000 from extension of the east breakwater is expected.

At the present time two commercial fishing companies operate out of Lorain. It is hoped that requested improvements would directly benefit not only the present but future operators of such companies, by at least $5,000 per year, and possibly much more.

It is expected that proposed improvements would also reduce dredging costs in the outer harbor, due to stoppage of littoral drift from the east into the outer harbor. This, plus the elimination of 500 feet of the east pier, should bring about benefits of about $5,000 per year.

All these benefits, summarized, amount to a total of $470,559.

The normal annual maintenance for Lorain Harbor, including the river, is about $125,000 per year, by 1955 figures.

Improvements would also result in an increase in the waterborne commerce at Lorain Habor. An example of foreign exports moving via east coast ports from this area is shown by a record of export shipments furnished by the Thew Shovel Co. of Lorain, increasing from a 1950 tonnage of 2,403, at a dollar value of $2,126,931 to a 1955 estimate of 5,000 tons at $4,500,000.

I have mentioned the November 20 hearings, held for the purpose of considering improvements to Lorain Harbor in the interest of deep-draft bulk commerce. To elaborate a bit on this, let me point out that the St. Lawrence Seaway has been provided with a controlling depth of 27 feet from Montreal to Lake Erie. Completion of the seaway is scheduled to be available for deep-draft navigation on or about June 26 of this year.

However, construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway and deepening of the Great Lakes connecting channels will not result in a corresponding deepening of harbor facilities at all lake ports. Each harbor must be considered individually, as well as collectively, with other harbors in an area, and proposed improvements at any individual locality must be justified on their merits.

Today even the most hardened skeptic is convinced of the great potential of the St. Lawrence Seaway, which will create a fourth coast for America, and thereby add greatly to our Nation's economic and defensive might. I feel that Lorain must of necessity be in the forefront of any seaway and allied planning.

Iron ore and limestone are the two big major commodities heavy enough to draft most of the lake carriers down to the maximum permissible draft of 25.5 feet.

In the short period between 1956 and 1963 a total of more than half a billion dollars will have been invested in the construction of the seaway and deepening of the main channels to the new 27-foot project. Navigation costs alone of the seaway, as estimated in 1956, will have exceeded $355 million. This investment cannot begin to pay off unless and until the receiving and shipping harbors in the Great Lakes are likewise deepened to an equivalent depth and suitable turning basins are provided.

As I pointed out previously, the system originally designed in 1895 and in use in Lorain Harbor now, was intended for use by freighters of that day, with a length of from 300 to 400 feet. It must be borne in mind that the momentum of a large 700-foot carrier, fully drafted to 25.5 feet, is such that it cannot be maneuvered and safely brought to a slow speed within the short distance of about 2,000 feet now available at Lorain. The cost alone of damage to the large lake carriers will be, in case of accident, at least three or four times greater than in the case of the present smaller vessels.

It is therefore requested and urged that improvements be carried out in Lorain Harbor which will deepen it to accommodate vessels drafted to 25.5 feet in order to correspond with the maximum permissible draft in the seaway and connecting channels, and that bends in the river channel be widened and the turning basin in question widened and deepened correspondingly. In addition, and even more important, the previously enumerated improvements to the breakwater entrance to allow the huge carriers of 1960 and later to navigate safely the harbor at Lorain should and must be carried out.

Another very important aspect which should not be overlooked in connection with improvements to Lorain Harbor is our national defense. With the widespread destruction that is certain in the event of an atomic or hydrogen bomb attack at one of the Lake Erie ports, the Nation cannot afford to have but two or three Great Lakes harbors. The steel industry is the backbone of our national defense.

There should be at least six harbors in Lake Erie, with controlling depths of 27 feet, all adequately improved to handle the lake carriers. I feel Lorain belongs among this group.

The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, in its approval of an interim report of November 19, 1958, stated: "It is clear from present report that improvements on Lorain Harbor, as proposed, is economically justified, and would contribute to the value of the system of which it is an integral part." The Board accordingly recommended modification of the existing project for Lorain Harbor, and estimated the cost to the United States to be $19,323,000 for construction and an increase in annual maintenance from its previous figure of $42,400 to $50,900, provided local interests agreed to certain provisions. The city of Lorain has already agreed to these provisions and official action has been taken in this direction.

I had already, on September 16, received from Mayor Jaworski of Lorain, a certified copy of resolution of intent to cooperate with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for Lorain Harbor improvements, as set out in the corps interim report. The city of Lorain thus indicated its ability and willingness to carry out the provisions set forth as necessary for local interests by the Corps of Engineers.

In addition to the approval received from the Corps of Engineers, I have been advised that the Bureau of the Budget intends to set its stamp of approval on this harbor improvement project.

The Government's investment in Lorain Harbor in the past, since the original adoption of the Federal project in 1928, has been returned many times over in economic benefits from the more than 200 million tons of commerce which has passed through its busy channels.

While at first glance the appropriation may seem high, I feel, and am sure others concur, that the benefits to be derived by not only the steel industries, shipping industries, and the rank-and-file workers involved, will in the long run far outweigh the cost of this project.

I, therefore, respectfully urge this committee to approve this project on the basis of its importance to commerce, to national defense, and to the great potential growth in the midwest as a result of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

Mr. BLATNIK. If the members will look toward the bottom of page 2 of their agenda sheets, under Thursday, May 14, we have one beach erosion project, in Key West, Fla., House Document 413, 85th Congress.

KEY WEST, FLA.

Mr. Richard Eaton, Chief Technical Adviser, Beach Erosion Board, will make the presentation.

STATEMENT OF RICHARD EATON, CHIEF TECHNICAL ADVISER, BEACH EROSION BOARD

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, this proposed project was developed under the procedures prescribed in the River and Harbor Act of 1930. It resulted from a study made in corporation with the Corps of Engineers and the city of Key West, under the procedures that provided for this under the law.

The city of Key West is unique in the Florida region in that it has a very limited beach area. The shores for the most part are of limestone, and the beaches are quite sparse. In fact, there is only one 300-foot length of public beach on the island of Key West at the present time.

The purpose of the study was to investigate the feasibility of providing a public beach along 6,200 feet of frontage owned by the city of Key West, identified as the green strip on the map, which is fronting east on Roosevelt Highway. The highway being publicly owned, the city is the owner also of the land submerged on the seaward side. This segment of shore was originally a natural beach in the state of nature, but in order to protect the highway, a seawall was built in 1926 along this frontage, following which the sand beach slowly disappeared, until today there is no beach left.

The study developed that it was practicable to artificially construct or reconstruct a beach in this area by the excavation from the offshore region of stone material, placing it in front of the bulkhead proper, and then carpeting that stone with a blanket of sand two feet thick to provide a recreational beach.

This would have the dual benefit of not only providing a recreational beach, but in addition providing a deepened and much more desirable area for bathing immediately off the beach. The slopes in this region are quite flat and depths are shallow and the bottom is now stone. Therefore, the combined effects of the project would provide a very desirable recreational area.

The costs of the project modified up to the January 1959 level are $732,600. Since the project involves entirely publicly owned shore and a public improvement, the recommended Federal contribution toward the cost is the full one-third permitted by existing law or $244,200. The annual charges totaling $80,600 are composed in part of the cost of periodic nourishment of this shore in order to preserve the beach that will be created, at an expense of $35,300 per annum, and maintenance by recovering sand that is pulled into the offshore dredge area.

The project recommends that the United States will bear one-third of the cost for a period of 10 years of the nourishment phase of the preservation of the beach; in other words, one-third of the $35,300 item in the annual charges.

The annual benefits which consist of preventing damage to the highway and the seawall, amount to $28,800; the benefits from increased earning power of the property on Key West amount to $114,000; and the recreational benefits are estimated at $55,200 annually. Total benefits are thus presently estimated at $203,700 and the benefit-cost ratio is 2.5 to 1. The usual local cooperation requirements are incorporated in the project document, and the Bureau of the Budget has expressed no objection to the submission of this report to Congress. The city manager of Key West has advised that the city commission is prepared to comply with the conditions of local cooperation and that the city is able to finance its share of the cost of the project.

I believe this completes my description of this project.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Eaton, I notice this project provides for restoration of a beach rather than prevention of further beach erosion.

Mr. EATON. The prevention of further beach erosion would be accomplished under the plan for periodic nourishment and of course for maintenance. It is not expected that there will be rapid erosion of this shore. The littoral drift rate is quite low in this area. The major destruction will occur during storms, following which the beach will be restored by the replacement of lost material. The rock will be displaced very slowly and the sand will be pulled off perhaps during storms.

Mr. BLATNIK. What use is now being made of this stretch of beach?

Mr. EATON. It has no recreational value at the present time. It is actually submerged in its present state and the seawall is the shoreline, the seawall protects the highway, so there is no beach at the present time along this frontage. The estimated present tourist traffic or tourist trade in Key West is about 200,000 visits annually. It is estimated that with the improvement of this beach, the tourist traffic will increase to approximately 500,000 annually. The present tourist accommodations which provide for about 5,000 people will be increased to about 11,000 with this project.

Mr. BLATNIK. Are we in effect then merely building another strip of beach for the Key West people?

Mr. EATON. This is creating, in effect, or restoring the only public recreational beach that will be available on Key West, except for the 300-foot frontage I mentioned earlier. This would of course permit the development of the interior lands to a much higher degree than they have been able to do previously.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. I want to ask one or two questions. First, I understand that this stretch of beach is publicly owned?

Mr. EATON. Yes, sir.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. There are no private interests on either side?

Mr. EATON. There are private lands of course in the rear of the beach, in the rear of the highway, and practically all the remainder of the Key West Island.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Will the privately owned property be benefited in any way?

Mr. EATON. There will perhaps be small benefits to adjoining privately owned beaches to the westward, but those benefits will probably be very small because the littoral drift rate here is quite low and sand which departs from this beach and moves to adjoining shores will be nominal in quantity, according to the estimates in the report.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Now in working out the costs, the usual formula of one-third—two-thirds has been used, is that correct?

Mr. EATON. Yes, sir.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. One-third Federal expense and two-thirds local expense?

Mr. EATON. Yes, sir.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. I notice in the statement before me that it is planned to dig out a shelf rock, offshore, and take the rock and place it on the beach and cover the beach with 2 feet of sand?

Mr. EATON. Yes, sir; that is correct.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Isn't that a very unusual practice?

Mr. EATON. It is, it is quite unique in the annals of this type of work and would be permissible and desirable only under the peculiar conditions that prevail at this site.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Are the engineers satisfied that by excavating this rock and thereby making presumably a trench it will not encourage more beach erosion?

Mr. EATON. In this case, sir, the engineers felt confident it will not, inasmuch as the shelf which lies beyond the trench is quite shallow and quite broad, and the size of waves which will actually reach the shore will not be altered by this relatively minor excavation in front of the present shore.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. In nourishment of the beaches, it would involve entirely sand afterward?

Mr. EATON. Yes, sir. Part of that sand, incidentally, is placed upon the beach and will be pulled by storms into the trench. It will be necessary, we estimate at 3-year intervals, to go out with a dragline and pull that sand back to the shore. There will always be a net loss of sand, at a low rate of about 10,000 yards per year which will have to be restored by imported sand for nourishment purposes.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Is it fair to say that this program is somewhat in the nature of an experiment?

Mr. EATON. I don't believe that it would be quite in the category of an experiment. Modified versions of it have been successfully employed. It is unique, as I mentioned earlier, to this area, but the forces involved are believed to be sufficiently well known to make it a safe project to undertake. The Beach Erosion Board felt it was the proper procedure in this case and that it will be more likely to provide the favorable results than any other plan that could be considered.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. I don't want any of my questions to be interpreted that I am opposed to beach erosion work, because I am not. I am an advocate of that work, especially on the New Jersey coastline and if we could get our State to loosen up a bit, perhaps we could get some work done there. But I think we must be cautious in these matters, not to do too much experimenting. Thank you very much.

Mr. MCFALL. Mr. Eaton, as I understand, there is no beach erosion there now because there is nothing to erode. The beach erosion will arise when you place the sand in there, which will erode and then you will have a beach erosion project.

Mr. EATON. That is correct.

Mr. MCFALL. In other words, we are constructing a beach erosion project, is that right, sir?

Mr. EATON. We are restoring a beach that existed at one time in nature. I may say this occasion arises frequently in the annals of Federal assistance toward erosion control; quite often the problem is not attacked until the beach has been eroded and then it is necessary to restore it. Of course after you restore it you are creating again conditions where erosion may repeat itself. However, in studies of this nature, an attempt is made to estimate accurately the requirements for nourishment or maintenance, or whatever may be required, to insure that the erosion will not create a future unforeseen problem.

Mr. MCFALL. Did the Federal Government construct anything in this area which caused this erosion or was this a natural result of wave action or why is this beach gone and how long has it been gone?

Mr. EATON. The beach has been slowly deteriorating to its present state since 1926, at which time a seawall was built to protect the high-

way. I believe the seawall was a local project. I don't know of any Federal interest in the seawall itself. The seawall, by creating a place for waves to be stopped suddenly and causing them to reflect from it, would tend to pull the material offshore, as it customarily does, and destroy the remaining beach that existed at that point.

Mr. McFALL. Thank you.

Mr. BLATNIK. Any further questions?

Mr. HARGIS. Mr. Chairman, I was born in Key West, Fla., and raised there for a while and I know the beach he is talking about, and I personally would actually like to see it down there, because I can remember running around down there where he is talking about and it is all rocks against this wall at this time, isn't it?

Mr. EATON. There are some rocks against it, but not enough to give it full protection. There is still danger during severe storms.

Mr. HARGIS. I remember the waves there.

Mr. McFALL. Can the gentleman remember any beach?

Mr. HARGIS. No, I was there in the twenties, and he was talking about when I was a little kid, but all I remember is rocks beside the highway.

Mr. EATON. The beach was at its best, probably, a good deal earlier than the twenties, before the highway was even built. The highway destroyed the natural beach.

Mr. HARGIS. They filled in for the highway too; I have also visited Key West every year for 15 years after I moved.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Eaton, if this beach is not restored, what threat is there to any further erosion damage that may damage public facilities? I notice you have an airport beyond the proposed beach shoreline.

Mr. EATON. As long as the seawall is maintained, there is little hazard of further destruction of the shore in this region. The seawall maintenance is estimated at about $29,000 per year, and as long as that money is spent, or whatever money is required to maintain the seawall, there is little likelihood of further shore damage.

Mr. BLATNIK. Does the Federal Government maintain the seawall?

Mr. EATON. No, sir, I believe it is the property of the city and I think the city has that responsibility.

Mr. McFALL. Would this project decrease the maintenance on the seawall?

Mr. EATON. Yes, sir, that is a benefit that is taken into consideration under the project. The sand beach would protect it.

Mr. BLATNIK. Thank you very much, Mr. Eaton.

This completes the public hearings on the various projects and resolutions before the committee.

(Whereupon, at 10:55 a.m., the hearings were adjourned.)

(The following was furnished for insertion:)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 13, 1959.

In re beach erosion project, Key West, Fla.

Hon. JOHN A. BLATNIK,
Chairman, Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee,
House Public Works Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write to let you know of my continuing interest in the beach erosion project for Key West, Fla., an active project now before your committee.

As you will note from the engineers' report, the city officials of Key West since initiating a request for this construction in 1955, have been extremely cooperative and conscientious in their negotiations with the engineers on this matter.

I hope this project will be favorably considered by your committee in connection with your study of the public works authorization bill now under review.

Cordially,

DANTE B. FASCELL, *Member of Congress.*

BAY CITY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Bay City, Tex., May 13, 1959.

Hon. JOHN A. BLATNIK,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BLATNIK: We deeply appreciate the opportunity to present the brief of the Colorado River feeder channel project to you on Monday, May 4 at a meeting of the Public Works Subcommittee.

Sincerely yours,

D. F. WIGINTON, *President.*

RIVER AND HARBOR AND FLOOD CONTROL OMNIBUS BILL, 1959

THURSDAY, MAY 21, 1959

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL
OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10:55 a.m., room 1302, New House Office Building, Hon. Clifford Davis (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Mr. DAVIS. The subcommittee will be in order.

As you know, gentlemen, we knew last year that we would have to have an omnibus bill this year with some river and harbor projects and some flood control projects, particularly because certain river basins were running out of authorized money. We should have no difficulty, in the consideriation of this section of the bill because we are not going to consider any item that does not have the approval of the Bureau of the Budget. That is going a long way for some of us, but this is one time when we are going to simplify our work. There will be no project considered unless it has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget.

With your cooperation, we are going to have another session on the 26th and the 27th of May. Of course, we are unduly delayed here today, but if you will try to cooperate we will finish these items we have before us this morning.

The first project you have before you is the Blackstone River in Rhode Island. The sponsors of that bill are Mr. Fogarty and Mr. Forand.

Who from the Corps of Engineers will address himself to that, Mr. Brennan?

Mr. BRENNAN. Colonel Smith, sir.

BLACKSTONE RIVER, RHODE ISLAND (S. DOC. 87, 85TH CONG.)

Mr. DAVIS. Colonel Smith, will you come around and clear that project for us, please?

STATEMENT OF COL. STEPHEN E. SMITH, ASSISTANT CHIEF OF CIVIL WORKS, CORPS OF ENGINEERS—Resumed

Colonel SMITH. Mr. Chairman, this is an interim report put in in response to a resolution of the Senate Committee on Public Works adopted September 14, 1955.

This project is a local protection project plan for the prevention of flood damages in the Blackstone River Basin immediately downstream from an existing project in the city of Woonsocket, R.I.

Mr. DAVIS. Colonel, do we have a fact sheet on this so that we can follow it a little closer?

Mr. BRENNAN. Yes, sir.

Colonel SMITH. The city of Woonsocket is a major textile and manufacturing center in northeastern Rhode Island. In 1950 the population was 50,000 and the population of the metropolitan area was about 89,000.

The Blackstone River winds through the city of Woonsocket from the northwest to the southeast. It is joined by two tributaries in the center of the city, Mill River and Peters River. The drainage area in the river basin above the project is 416 square miles. Part of this area will be controlled by the West Hill Reservoir, which is now under construction and scheduled for completion in June of 1961. Another project for local protection of Upper Woonsocket is now under construction and will be completed in November of this year. This project will protect Woonsocket from floods in the Blackstone River downstream as far as Main Street. From there up it will be protected, but it will furnish no protection to the city below Main Street.

The project we are considering today will protect lower Woonsocket downstream from Main Street from floods in the Blackstone River, and Mill River and Peters River.

Since 1929 there have been five major floods in Woonsocket, three of which caused very heavy damage. The greatest flood of record was in August of 1955, when Hurricane Diane dumped 7 to 13 inches of rainfall throughout the basin, which was already saturated as a result of Hurricane Connie a few days before. The flood damages in lower Woonsocket below Main Street in that flood amounted to $12,300,000.

On an annual basis the flood damages will average $215,000 per year after the West Hill Reservoir is in operation.

Various plans for the protection of lower Woonsocket were evaluated. We considered channel improvements of all the streams plus reservoirs on the Blackstone River and on the Mill River and on Peters River. None of these plans proved economical. The Chief of Engineers now recommends construction on these three streams of about 9,500 feet of levees and flood walls, 4,700 feet of channel improvement and 2,300 feet of underground pressure conduit, and two pumping stations, and the removal of two existing dams on the Blackstone River—Vernon and Hamlet Dams.

The recommended improvement in conjunction with the West Hill Reservoir will reduce flood damages about 90 percent if the maximum flood of record reoccurs.

Local interests will be required to contribute in cash 16.1 percent of the cost of the work to be accomplished by the Federal Government, presently estimated at $570,000; furnish all lands, easements and rights-of-way, and hold and save the United States free from damages, including claims, if any, for water rights; accomplish without cost to the United States all changes and alterations and additions to or relocations of any utilities or buildings made necessary by the work; and maintain and operate the works after it is completed.

The estimated first cost of the plan based on 1956 price levels is $4,255,000. Of this amount the Federal cost is estimated at $2,970,000 and the non-Federal cost is $1,285,000. Annual charges are $167,800 and annual benefits are $235,000, of which $140,000 is flood prevention benefits and $95,000 is land enhancement benefits.

The benefit-cost ratio is 1.4 to 1. The Bureau of the Budget and other Federal agencies offer no objection to the project, and the State of Rhode Island favors its construction.

That completes my presentation, sir.

Mr. DAVIS. The Bureau of the Budget approves it and the Corps of Engineers recommends it and the State concurs.

Colonel SMITH. Yes, sir.

Mr. MACK. I noticed the local contribution is extremely large, totaling about one-third of the entire cost. Is that due mainly to the enhancement of lands, buildings, and other properties?

Colonel SMITH. It is due entirely to land enhancement. Yes, sir.

Mr. MACK. And the benefit-cost ratio of 1.4 includes both the Federal and local contribution?

Colonel SMITH. It does.

Mr. DAVIS. Are there any questions on the part of anybody on the committee?

(No response.)

Mr. DAVIS. Thank you, Colonel Smith.

CONNOQUENESSING CREEK AT BUTLER, PA. (H. DOC. 110, 86TH CONG.)

Mr. DAVIS. We will ask Col. Arthur Nauman to come around. This is on Connoquenessing Creek, Pa. Our colleague, Mr. Clark, has been working on this project for about 10 years. So Colonel Nauman, we will be glad to have you sit down and give us the facts on this project.

STATEMENT OF COL. ARTHUR C. NAUMAN, ASSISTANT CHIEF OF CIVIL WORKS, CORPS OF ENGINEERS—Resumed

Colonel NAUMAN. Mr. Chairman, the project under consideration is a channel improvement for prevention of flood damages at Butler, Pa. This study was authorized by House Public Works Committee resolution dated April 12, 1956.

The city of Butler and Butler Township comprise an important industrial area along Connoquenessing Creek in western Pennsylvania. Heavy industry, railroads, highways, and numerous commercial developments are located here. In 1950 the population of Butler was about 35,500.

Major floods may occur at Butler any time during the year, but the most severe have resulted from summer storms. Since 1923, 18 floods have exceeded the stage at which extensive damage begins, the maximum of record in October 1954 exceeding this level by almost 5 feet. Under present conditions recurrence of the record flood would inundate about 300 acres and cause damages of about $1,735,000. On an annual basis, flood damages will average about $235,000.

Protection of Butler by means of reservoirs would be very costly. Dikes or floodwalls would be impracticable from the standpoint of economics and operation. Channel improvement, combined with cutoff of a bend in Connequenessing Creek, proved to be the only means

of providing a substantial degree of flood protection within the limits of economic justification. Local interests did not express preference for any particular plan of improvement.

The Chief of Engineers recommends enlargement and protection of the channel of Connoquenessing Creek, including an appurtenant cutoff; beginning near the mouth of Sawmill Run below Lyndora and extending upstream beyond the South Monroe Street bridge in Butler. The total length via the improved channel and cutoff would be about 4 miles.

Local interests will be required to:

(*a*) Provide all lands, easements, rights-of-way, and spoil disposal areas necessary for construction of the project;

(*b*) bear the expense of necessary railroad and utility alterations required for the project;

(*c*) establish and enforce project channel limits to prevent encroachments on the improvements;

(*d*) hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; and

(*e*) maintain and operate all works after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army.

The city of Butler, Butler Township, and Butler County have expressed willingness to meet the requirements of local cooperation.

The improvement recommended by the Chief of Engineers will pass floods 32 percent greater than the maximum of record with practically no damage.

The estimated first cost of the plan is $1,999,500. Of this amount, $1,558,700 is the estimated Federal cost for construction and $440,800 is the estimated local cost for rights-of-way, relocations, and utility adjustments. Annual charges are $58,500 Federal and $21,600 local, including $5,700 for maintenance. The total annual charges are $80,100. Average annual benefits, all from elimination of flood damages, are estimated at $235,000. The benefit-cost ratio is 2.9 to 1.

The Bureau of the Budget and other Federal agencies offer no objections to the project. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania favors its construction.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my summary.

Mr. DAVIS. Thank you. That benefit-cost ratio is very good, 2.9 to 1, and the city of Butler and the State have approved this, and the Corps of Engineers recommends it, and the Bureau of the Budget approved it.

Mr. CLARK. And Mr. Clark approved it.

Mr. DAVIS. And Mr. Clark over there, who has been working on it so long, approved it.

Mr. MACK. I would like to suggest if this project is approved, which it should be in view of its high benefit-cost ratio, that the name of the creek be changed to that of its sponsor, Mr. Clark.

Mr. DAVIS. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. DAVIS. Thank you, Colonel.

HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS AT NATCHEZ, MISS. (S. DOC. 16, 86TH CONG.)

Mr. DAVIS. Next is Natchez Harbor, which is a project sponsored by Mr. Williams of Mississippi.

Mr. Angus H. McRae will describe that project for us. Will you have a seat there, Mr. McRae?

This was authorized in the 86th Congress by a Senate document.

Mr. McRae, tell us all about it. We have the fact sheet on it here.

STATEMENT OF ANGUS H. McRAE, ASSISTANT CHIEF OF CIVIL WORKS, CORPS OF ENGINEERS—Resumed

Mr. MCRAE. Mr. Chairman, the study considers a port and terminal area for the city of Natchez, Miss., about 60 miles downstream from Vicksburg, in response to a resolution of the Senate Public Works Committee adopted July 30, 1955.

The improvement was recommended by the Mississippi River Commission. However, the report by the Chief of Engineers was unfavorable to the improvement. The plan of improvement would provide a levee and pumping station to protect the port area from Mississippi River floods in an area of about 212 acres. The local cooperation specified by the Mississippi River Commission would require the furnishing of lands, easements and rights-of-way, relocation of roads, railroads, and utilities, and require them to make a contribution estimated at $2,500, and construct and operate terminal facilities open to all on equal terms, as well as maintain and operate the works, except dredging in the Mississippi River. It also requires that a port authority be established to operate the facility and to hold and save the Government free from damages.

The plan recommended by the commission would cost $700,000, of which $437,500 would be Federal. The annual charges are estimated at $40,000, and annual benefits at $158,000. The benefit-cost ratio is estimated to be 3.95 to 1.

The Bureau of the Budget had no objection to the submission of the Chief of Engineers' report. The State of Mississippi represented by the highway department stated that the improvement would have no effect on any of their improvements.

The Board of Supervisors of Adams County, Miss., have assured the local cooperation, and they are in favor of the project.

In the Chief of Engineers' report dated September 16, 1958, which is included in the document referred to, Senate Document 16, the Chief of Engineers points out that the proposed work is actually a terminal development and the work normally associated with harbor improvement is not required. He states, and I quote:

> The well-established basic principle of port development wherein the Federal Government provides a navigable channel and local interests the landside port and terminal facilities is a sound one and there are no special circumstances warranting a departure therefrom in this case.

Accordingly, the Chief of Engineers recommends that no Federal project be adopted at this time. He points out too that the Commission notes in its report, the Mississippi River Commission notes in its report, two somewhat similar projects involving land fills provide somewhat free port terminal and industrial areas elsewhere in the Mississippi River largely at Federal expense. It is true that the

spoil from the dredging required for the authorized navigation channels in each of these projects was less than the amount required for the fill. Nevertheless, there substantial amounts were obtained as by-products of dredging and the remainder, while also large in amount, may be considered as a necessary supplement to the work that has always been considered to be in the public interest.

That completes the prepared statement, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Smith has some questions.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. McRae, the benefit-cost ratio of this project is 3.95 to 1, according to your report. Is that correct?

Mr. MCRAE. Yes, sir. In the Mississippi River Commission's report it is 3.95 to 1.

Mr. SMITH. The project was approved by the Mississippi River Commission, was it not?

Mr. MCRAE. Yes, sir. It was recommended to the Chief of Engineers.

Mr. SMITH. I note that the Chief of Engineers said this would diverge from established Federal policy in respect to port improvements and harbor improvements. Are you familiar with the other harbor improvements along the Mississippi River perhaps, and in other areas of the country?

Mr. MCRAE. Particularly along the Mississippi I have some familiarity.

Mr. SMITH. You are familiar with the one in Memphis, are you not?

Mr. MCRAE. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMITH. How much of that project is for purely dredging? What percentage of it?

Mr. MCRAE. I do not have it percentagewise, but there is a harbor channel.

Mr. SMITH. There is President's Island, which was cut and dredged, and of course the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. Davis, is familiar with the project. The point I am making is, is not about two-thirds of that project the same thing as is proposed in the Natchez project?

Mr. MCRAE. There is this difference in the Memphis project and the Natchez project: The plan recommended by the Mississippi River Commission at Natchez contemplated no dredging.

Mr. SMITH. Of course, the channel in the Mississippi River at Natchez is extremely deep, or relatively deep, is it not?

Mr. MCRAE. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. There is no necessity for dredging at Natchez. In other words, it is silly to recommend dredging at Natchez.

Mr. MCRAE. There is no necessity for dredging for a barge channel at Natchez. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH. This plan by the Mississippi River Commission proposes a total expenditure of $437,000 to the Federal Government for this Natchez port.

Mr. MCRAE. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH. How much has been spent with the approval of the Chief of Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget for the similar work at Memphis?

Mr. MCRAE. The Memphis project is about 75 percent complete. They have spent some $13 million on the project at Memphis.

Mr. SMITH. In other words, the same type of work that is against the policy there has had $14 million spent on it, and yet the Chief of Engineers' office says that this $437,000 is an improper expenditure?

Mr. MCRAE. He points out, as I mentioned, in his report, that the elements that go along with the other projects are not present in the Natchez project.

Mr. SMITH. Of course, there is no dredging in Natchez and there was an element of dredging in Memphis, which is a very fine project. I mean, it has been a very judicious expenditure of funds, but the point I raise is here is a relatively minor project with such a small expenditure involved, and just because there happens to be no dredging involved the Chief of Engineers Office says it cannot be done; whereas perhaps 30 times as much is spent for, or is being spent just a few miles up the river, for exactly the same type of work with the approval of the Chief of Engineers.

What I would like to know is, how does the Chief of Engineers decide one should be approved and the other should not?

Mr. MCRAE. Of course, the other reports were made some time ago, but the Natchez improvement is applying the criteria which would be for transportation savings and some land enhancement for work that he considers not related to a navigation project as such.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. McRae, how would this compare then with the harbor at Greenville, Miss., which likewise is a good harbor? We have been talking about Memphis. How would it compare with Greenville?

Mr. MCRAE. The Greenville harbor, Mr. Chairman, has an element that the Natchez proposal does not have. That is, the dredging is required at the Greenville harbor.

Mr. SMITH. The same remarks I made about Memphis would apply to Vicksburg and Baton Rouge and others. I was not just picking Memphis out. I only used it as an illustration because it is the largest.

Mr. DAVIS. Of course, Memphis had 6,000-odd acres of an island there, and Mr. McRae will remember that they had to close the top part of it, which left a channel on the other side of the river. Of course, the barges come down the river and then go up the channel to a terminal which Memphis has constructed at its own expense. And of course, it took care of all of the utilities and roads.

As Mr. Smith said, it is a very splendid project and there was considerably more involved in that than dredging alone.

Mr. Mack.

Mr. MACK. Mr. McRae, when Mrs. Mack and I came back to Washington, D.C., last year from Washington State we drove down to Natchez and looked over that city. We were charmed and fascinated by its many attractions and by the courtesy and kindness of its people. I therefore, individually, would like to be helpful to this project if I can be. I note that the benefit-cost ratio is extremely high—namely, 3.95 to 1, and that the local community is willing to contribute $262,000, which is about 40 percent of the $700,000 total cost.

I am not quite clear as to the Army Engineers' opposition to the project. What is the depth of the river at Natchez?

Mr. MCRAE. The center of the river or the normal bottom of the river is 40 feet deep.

Mr. MACK. 40 feet?

Mr. McRAE. Yes, but the port area—or the area adjacent to this proposed port area—has a normal depth of about 15 feet, which compares with the normal barge channel of 12 feet. So there is ample depth adjacent to the proposed area in Natchez.

Mr. MACK. Is it the position of the Army Engineers that the local interests should do the dredging outside the main channel?

Mr. McRAE. There would be no dredging required outside the main channel. It is possible at some future time there may be some maintenance dredging required there, but it would be very minor.

Mr. MACK. What type of boats use this channel or port?

Mr. McRAE. It would be the normal river towboats.

Mr. MACK. Is there any industry in Natchez which would require shipping?

Mr. McRAE. There are industries at Natchez now, and the sponsors of the project there feel that there are maybe as many as 5 large industries and some 30 smaller industries, perhaps, that are looking for places to locate their plants. They have no assurance that I know of that they would locate on this particular area if it were constructed. However, it might well be attractive to industry coming in.

Mr. MACK. It is the opinion of the Army Engineers that no dredging is necessary to meet the present needs of the port or the needs within the immediate future?

Mr. McRAE. That is correct. If any is required in the immediate future it would be very minor.

Mr. MACK. Has the Government, under its policy as a precedent, ever done dredging in locations similar to the Natchez one, with similar problems involved?

Mr. McRAE. Not except in an authorized project. Normally, along the Mississippi River on port fronts. For instance, at the New Orleans Harbor there is a special situation there where we have oceangoing vessels, and the project channel is somewhat riverward of the fronts of the docks. The requirement there is that local interests perform dredging dockside, whereas the Federal maintenance program takes care of the channel out in the river. The project channel is in the river, but that is an oceangoing proposition primarily. Greater depths are required to maneuver the boats alongside of the docks there.

Mr. MACK. Thank you, Mr. McRae.

Mr. DAVIS. Are there any other questions?

Our colleague, Mr. John Bell Williams, is here. He is the sponsor of this project. Would you like to be heard in a general statement, Mr. Williams?

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS, MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI; ACCOMPANIED BY ARLIE C. WARREN, PRESIDENT, ADAMS COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, NATCHEZ, MISS.; AND OAK DUKE, MANAGER, NATCHEZ ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE, NATCHEZ, MISS.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I have a brief prepared statement and I would like to request permission to be accompanied by Mr. Arlie Warren of Natchez, Miss., who is president of the Board of Supervisors of Adams County, in which Natchez is located, and in which this project will be located if it is completed. Also Mr. Oak Duke, who is manager of the Natchez Association of Commerce.

These gentlemen might be able to answer any technical questions that the committee might see fit to propose following the prepared testimony which I have to offer.

Mr. DAVIS. They are present?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, sir.

Mr. DAVIS. Fine. You gentlemen may come up and sit beside Mr. Williams.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, first permit me to express my appreciation for the committee giving us a hearing on this matter. Of course, we hope that we will be able to present a good case and we believe we will. Our testimony will be brief and, I hope, cogent.

For the committee's consideration, I would like to review certain facts which we feel justify the inclusion of the Natchez Harbor project in the omnibus flood control bill now receiving your attention.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I would like to mention briefly some of the things that Mr. Mack mentioned a moment ago in preface to my statement.

Natchez, on the river, has played a large part in the history and development of America, and particularly the lower Mississippi Valley. Everyone here is familiar with the role Natchez assumed as a cotton-marketing center in the first half of the 19th century and the society which it created. Pre-Civil War homes—and I prefer, Mr. Chairman, that we refer to that as the "war for southern independence" rather than the Civil War—still stand as monuments to those days that are quite obviously gone forever. These ante bellum homes are open to the public, and in March of each year the Natchez pilgrimage welcomes thousands of visitors who briefly relive the era of a century ago.

Natchez was a stop for both side-wheel and stern-wheel packet boats such as the *Natchez* and the *Robert E. Lee*, both of which made the trip between New Orleans and St. Louis in less than 4 days. Mark Twain, of course, has immortalized this portion of Mississippi River history.

Legend has it that Jim Bowie first used his famous knife at Natchez-Under-the-Hill, where the taverns were frequented by crew members, roustabouts and others—a considerable number of which could be charitably referred to as the criminal element.

Andrew Jackson was married just a few miles out of Natchez.

During the 19th century, Natchez was a major port on the Mississippi River. Introduction of the towboat brought about a progressive decline in river traffic at Natchez. Today, river transportation consists largely of the use of barges. Because of inadequate port facilities, Natchez today cannot handle barges and therefore there is no traffic at that point.

Following World War II, Natchez experienced tremendous industrial growth. I used the word "tremendous" here, but I would say it is actually phenomenal industrial growth. Oil was discovered in the vicinity a few years ago and the economy of the Natchez area is rapidly expanding. There are several oilfields within 10 or 12 miles of the city of Natchez. In the past 10 years, Natchez has become one of the leading industrial cities in the State of Mississippi.

There is a definite need for a modern port facility at Natchez. Local citizens approved a $1 million bond issue to build this facility.

Recently, construction was completed of levees, railroad embankment, road, and industrial fill at a cost of $285,000. When river stages permit, construction will begin on the wharf.

Three hundred and twenty-eight acres of land were purchased adjacent to the proposed harbor and it is contemplated that this tract will be developed as an industrial site. This project is immediately south of Natchez, the only one suitable, as the city is situated on a high bluff, as everyone knows. This area needs flood control protection. This is below the bluff.

In accordance with a resolution adopted by the Senate Committee on Public Works on July 30, 1955, the Corps of Engineers submitted a report. The Mississippi River Commission recommended the project but the Chief, Corps of Engineers, disapproved it.

Approval was withheld on the grounds that it was not a navigation project; the land flooded now does not need protection from the ravages of the Mississippi; and the benefit-to-cost ratio is insufficient. I believe that we can successfully refute these arguments of the Chief of Engineers.

Of course, as you gentlemen know, this is a policy decision and the Corps of Engineers does not make policy—Congress makes policy and the Corps of Engineers' only function is to carry out a directive of the Congress.

Even though the final decision was a policy decision, there is division within the corps on the policy question, inasmuch as the district engineer and the Mississippi River Commission recommended the Natchez Harbor project.

In my judgment, flood control protection for the Natchez Harbor is not unprecedented and there are other harbor projects on the Mississippi River and reclamation projects over the entire country which fall into a similar category and which have been approved in recent years by the Congress.

In this connection, I would like to read two paragraphs of the report of the Mississippi River Commission, which I will insert in full at the end of my remarks:

It is believed that the recommendations pertaining to local cooperation set forth in the district engineer's report are generally in accord with the cost allocation policy announced by the Bureau of the Budget in Circular A–47, dated December 31, 1952, for projects of this nature. It is the opinion of this commission that the provisions of a harbor and port area, as proposed by the district engineer, is properly a modification of the comprehensive project for navigation and flood control for the alluvial valley of the lower Mississippi. Although precedents established by Congress in authorizing previous modifications to the basic project are not necessarily controlling for all time, the commission observes that the Congress has previously prescribed certain requirements of local cooperation in connection with river port development at Memphis, Vicksburg, and Baton Rouge. Previously prescribed requirements for projects similar to that proposed at Natchez are repeated in this instance. It is believed that uniformity of policy on a valley development project of this magnitude is highly desirable in order to avoid discrimination between areas. In the absence of congressional direction differing from that included in recent legislation authorizing similar river port improvements, this report is submitted without substantial change in the degree of local cooperation required elsewhere in the lower valley.

The proposed improvement is primarily a navigation project, and incidental thereto a very necessary port area is protected from floods. Land-enhancement benefits result but they are incidental to the undertaking of the navigation project. It is not considered feasible to separate the navigation project from the flood control project as neither would exist without the other. The com-

mission concurs with the district engineer with respect to his conclusion that the proposed plan of improvement is more satisfactory from the standpoint of first cost and maintenance than the traditional plan of channel excavation from the main channel of the Mississippi leading to a port area.

I would like to emphasize that the people of Adams County and Natchez, Miss., are building this harbor facility with their own money. They are not requesting the Federal Government to build it for them. Mr. Chairman, I would like to include in the record following my testimony a breakdown of the way the Adams County Port Commission has, or will, spend this million dollars. They are merely asking for protection from the floodwaters of the Mississippi River.

The report estimates that the total flood control protection cost would be approximately $700,000, of which the Federal share is estimated to be $437,000. The local citizens of Natchez have already spent about $200,000, as I mentioned a moment ago, on this item by constructing a high level embankment. The Corps of Engineers would extend this levee system, construct revetments, and install drainage ditches and a pumping station.

Since existing natural depths are adequate for vessel access to the dock facilities, no harbor improvements are required. However, it is estimated that maintenance dredging would be necessary out to the Mississippi River channel at an annual cost of $6,000 to the Federal Government.

The total annual charges are estimated at $40,000. The Mississippi River Commission estimates that the benefit-to-cost ratio is 3.95 to 1.

The private economic survey indicates that potential commerce will be 200,000 tons annually at this facility, which represents transportation savings of nearly $800,000 a year to the people of the Natchez area. I am convinced that the transportation savings, enhanced land values, overall economic value of the terminal to the Natchez trade area, and potential economic advantages should be considered in coming up with a benefit-to-cost ratio.

The initial survey conducted by a private engineer concludes that $399,600 of benefits would accrue annually from existing industries and therefore the benefit-cost ratio would be 10 to 1.

I am aware that the Corps of Engineers has certain criteria which they use to justify their position with respect to specific projects. Moreover, any amateur economist could justify a benefit-to-cost figure pulled out of thin air.

I should like to point out again that local people are spending over a million dollars on this project, so they at least are convinced that annual benefits will be far more than annual costs.

This committee is in the unenviable position of having to determine whether the request is in line with what the committee considers to be the proper Federal area of flood control protection and navigation aid. I believe it does. Certainly, with local interest paying more than three-fourths of the cost of this project, Natchez should not be penalized—in relation to other harbor projects on the lower Mississippi—simply because there is not a long line of precedents and cases exactly in point.

I hope that the committee will give careful consideration to this project. I firmly believe that it would greatly enhance the economic development of the lower Mississippi Valley as well as the immediate Natchez area.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I would request permission to insert at this point as part of my remarks a summary of the proposed construction costs on the Natchez Port in Adams County, Miss., which has been prepared by the Adams County Port Commission.

Also, I believe, you have already had inserted in the record a copy of the report of the river commission. You have those available, I believe, do you not?

Mr. DAVIS. Without objection, those documents will be made a part of the record at this point.

(The documents referred to are as follows:)

Summary of proposed construction costs, 1958–61, proposed Natchez Port County, Miss.

1. Embankment (Cook Construction Co. contract—in progress):		
Construction cost (estimated maximum cost)	$192,450	
Engineering design	6,362	
Engineering supervision (2.4 percent)	4,618	
Acquisition of borrow pit	*6,500*	
Mississippi testing laboratory	2,500	
Total		$212,430
2. Soil investigation (chargeable to all projects):		
Spencer J. Buchanan & Associates, Inc	*6,981*	
Rental of tug and barge	597	
Total		7,578
3. Railroad (contract No. 2, spring 1959):		
Trackage, 7,100 linear feet at $9	*63,900*	
3 turnouts at $2,000	6,000	
320 linear feet 8-inch pipe at $2	*640*	
Total	70,540	
Engineering at 6 percent	4,232	
Total		74,772
4. *Dock structure (contract No. 3, spring 1959):*		
Revetment	41,985	
Structural steel	*95,000*	
Main piling	61,799	
Columns	16,760	
Deck	27,000	
Dolphins	10,185	
Drift fender	*10,700*	
Sheet pile cells	70,620	
Fender system	16,155	
Electric power and lighting	5,000	
Retaining wall	30,000	
Total	385,204	
Contingencies at 10 percent	*38,520*	
Total	423,724	
Engineering at 5.5 percent	23,305	
Total		447,029
5. Crane (purchase in fall of 1959):		
Crane, *f.o.b. factory*	*100,000*	
Shipping and erection charges	20,000	
Total		120,000
Total, items 1 through 5, construction to be accomplished in 1958–59		861,809

DEFERRED CONSTRUCTION TO BE ACCOMPLISHED IN 1960–61 AS SOON AS FILL HAS CONSOLIDATED AND OPERATION OF PORT JUSTIFIES THEIR CONSTRUCTION

6. Transit shed:		
Transit shed, 10,000 square feet, at $3.50	$35,000	
Engineering, at 6 percent	2,100	
Total		$37,100
7. Utilities:		
Water well, 300 feet at $10	3,000	
Pump and motor	3,000	
50,000-gallon elevated tank	30,000	
1,000 feet 6-inch pipe at $2.50	2,500	
5 hydrants at $180	900	
Sprinkler system for shed	2,000	
Total	41,400	
Engineering at 6 percent	2,484	
Total		43,884
Total deferred construction, items 6 and 7		80,984
Grand total, construction 1958–61		942,793

NOTE.—Prepared by Adams County Port Commission.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DAVIS. That is a very fine statement, Mr. Williams. I cannot follow the reasoning of the Chief of Engineers on this project. I just *cannot reconcile it. I wonder if there is such a thing, Mr. McRae,* as the Chief of Engineers taking a second look at this matter?

Mr. MCRAE. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, on the 18th of February of this year the Senate Committee on Public Works adopted a *resolution asking* us to do just that, and we will comply with the Senate Public Works Committee's resolution. If there are changed conditions which warrant some different conclusions, I am sure that will be done.

Mr. DAVIS. Do you have any idea how long it is going to take to make that reinvestigation or reexamination, *Mr. McRae?*

Mr. MCRAE. We sent that to our division engineer and asked for *that information, but it has not been received as yet. We can get* some estimate for the commitee, if you desire it.

Mr. SMITH. The division engineer has already approved it. So if you are sending it to him——

*Mr. DAVIS. I see where Natchez is spending $1 million, or three-*fourths of the total cost. I just feel like it is showing a different at*titude in Natchez than in the case of the other harbors on the river.* Of course, the whole purpose of all this money being spent on the river is to contain the water and to make more profits for the people of all sections of the country in the way of transportation and flood control. The more you use the river, the more of a return to the general national economy you have.

Are there any more questions?

Mr. SMITH. I want to point out that Mr. Williams' statement made a little bit clearer what I had brought out in my questions to Mr. McRae. Because the proposed Federal cost would be to protect this industrial area through some action and because it would be a flood control type of protection, rather than a navigation improvement, that is why the Chief of Engineers Office here said as a matter of policy they could not do it. I agree with Mr. Williams that this is a

policy issue for the Congress to decide, and not merely something for the Chief of Engineers Office, because all of the other criteria on local participation, benefit-cost ratio, and everything else, are fully in line.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Mack, do you have any further questions?

Mr. MACK. When one travels across the country 4,500 miles in an automobile, he gets rather confused as to the topography of special localities. As I recollect, Natchez is built on cliffs, is it not?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes. The city of Natchez is built on a cliff. This port is below the city.

Mr. MACK. It is considerably below the cliffs?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. This is so-called Natchez-Under-the-Hill, where Jim Bowie and others came from.

Mr. MACK. I recall the phrase, now that you mention it.

Mr. SMITH. Where John Bell Williams' chief support comes from.

Mr. MACK. How much land is in that lower level?

Mr. WILLIAMS. In this particular area I believe 328 acres, is it not? Three hundred and fifteen acres.

Mr. MACK. Do you have it quite extensively developed?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will let Mr. Warren answer that.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Warren, would you give your full name and address to the reporter, please?

Mr. WARREN. I am Arlie C. Warren from Natchez, Miss., president of the Adams County Board of Supervisors.

In answer to your question, sir, I would say that the area is fully developed in the adjacent port part of it, where it is above project flood level. The International Paper Co. has a $75 million dissolving pulp plant there, the only one of that type of plant operating in America, which takes cottonwood and willow, which grows along the river, hardwood, and creates a dissolving rayon pulp. The only other one in North America is in Canada, where they make this dissolving pulp. They have a tremendous plant there, and of course, there are oilfield areas all around there, which are above project flood.

This particular area where the port side is below the project flood level, and in extremely high water conditions of the river a portion of it does overflow.

Mr. MACK. And the levees would protect that area from being flooded?

Mr. WARREN. Yes, sir.

Mr. MACK. Has flooding occurred in the past?

Mr. WARREN. Yes, sir.

Mr. MACK. Has it ever been so extensive that it would damage or delay the operations of a pulp or paper mill?

Mr. WARREN. Yes, sir. Not in the area where the pulp and paper mill is now, but in the area where we propose the port. The land there is lower. It is in the same adjacent area, but a lower type of soil. The elevation is lower there. In fact, there is 35 feet of difference in the elevation.

Mr. MACK. Pulp and paper mills must operate 24 hours a day in order to be efficient and economic. We have them in my area. Of course, any flooding that damages pulp and paper operations would be very costly.

I think that is all.

Mr. DAVIS. Are there any questions over on this side? If you have a prepared statement, we have just about run out of time, but we will be glad to have you file it.

Mr. DUKE. My name is Oak Duke. I am the manager of the Association of Commerce in Natchez. I am merely accompanying Mr. Warren.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, these gentlemen were gracious enough to come up from Natchez not for the purpose of testifying, but for answering any questions your committee might desire to pose to them.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Warren is the chairman of the board that put up $1 million.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join with you in urging that the U.S. Army Engineers complete this survey as expeditiously as possible, so that we may have that report if it is at all possible before the consideration of this bill is completed.

Mr. DAVIS. The statement made by Mr. Williams and Mr. Warren has certainly excited the interest of all of this committee, and we are entirely sympathetic. We certainly do not want to see you dealt with unfairly. We will join in the request on this side of the Capitol to have the Corps of Engineers take another look at it as quickly as possible in the hopes that we can put this project in our bill.

Mr. WARREN. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, that is fair enough, and on behalf of these gentlemen and myself, the people of Natchez and Adams County and the people of Mississippi, we express our appreciation to you for the consideration accorded us here this morning.

Mr. DAVIS. We are always glad to help Mr. Williams, who is one of our fine colleagues.

(H.R. 109 follows.)

[H.R. 109, 86th Cong., 1st sess.]

A BILL To designatet the dam and reservoir to be constructed on the Pound River near Bartlick, Dickenson County, Virginia, as the "John W. Flannagan Dam and Reservoir"

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the dam and reservoir to be constructed on the Pound River near Bartlick, Dickenson County, Virginia, authorized by section 4 of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes", approved June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1216; Public Law 761, Seventy-fifth Congress), shall be known and designated hereafter as the "John W. Flannagan Dam and Reservoir". Any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States in which such dam and reservoir are referred to shall be held to refer to such dam and reservoir as the "John W. Flannagan Dam and Reservoir".

Mr. DAVIS. We have one bill which we may be able to dispose of quickly. It is sponsored by Mr. Jennings to designate the dam and reservoir to be constructed on the Pound River near Bartlick, Dickenson County, Va., as the John W. Flannagan Dam and Reservoir.

The Army Engineers have no objection and the Interior Department has no objection. The Bureau of the Budget, of course, have no objection, otherwise it would not be here.

Colonel Nauman is here to explain it. To conserve time, our colleague, Pat Jennings, of the Ninth District of Virginia has offered a

statement to the committee and asked that it be made a part of the record at this point. Without objection, that will be done.

(The statement of Mr. Jennings is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN W. PAT JENNINGS, NINTH DISTRICT, VIRGINIA, IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 109, A BILL TO DESIGNATE THE DAM AND RESERVOIR TO BE CONSTRUCTED ON THE POUND RIVER IN DICKERSON COUNTY, VA., AS THE "JOHN W. FLANNAGAN DAM AND RESERVOIR"

Mr. Chairman, members of the subcommittee, thank you for considering H.R. 109, a bill that I have introduced to authorize an appropriate name for a flood control project to be constructed in my congressional district. I appreciate, also, the opportunity of making this brief statement to you in explanation and support of the bill.

H.R. 109 would designate the Pound River Dam and Reservoir, authorized for construction by the Flood Control Act of 1938, as the "John W. Flannagan Dam and Reservoir." The Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army is currently engaged in the preconstruction planning of this project; it would be located approximately 1.3 miles above the mouth of Pound River near the community of Bartlick in Dickenson County, Va. It is anticipated that planning will be completed during fiscal year 1960. Construction will begin at the earliest practicable date—depending on the availability of funds. The project is a part of the flood control system envisioned for the Big Sandy River Basin in Virginia, Kentucky, and West Virginia.

The bill has two primary purposes:

First, it would honor a late Member of Congress from the Ninth Congressional District, John W. Flannagan; second, it would serve a very practical purpose in providing a new name for the Pound River project, and thus eliminate the confusion that now exists between this project and another dam proopsed farther upstream.

Let me explain these two objectives very briefly.

John W. Flannagan, who passed away in April 1955, was the Virginia Ninth District representative for 18 years. He was first elected to the 72d Congress in 1930 and reelected to each subsequent Congress through the 80th. He served on the House Agriculture Committee and was its chairman in the 79th Congress and the ranking minority member in the 80th Congress. He retired from the House at the end of his service in the 80th Congress.

The Pound River project is located in Dickenson County, where the late Congressman Flannagan lived and practiced law for several years. It is near the border of another county—Buchanan—where he was a local official before coming to Washington as a Congressman. The people of these two counties, and all of the Ninth District, favor this name for the Pound River Dam and Reservoir.

This proposed flood control project was authorized by Congress during the service of Congressman Flannagan. He was always greatly interested in the problems of the area to be served by the facility, especially in such programs as conservation, forestry, flood control, etc. It would be very appropriate for this project to bear his name.

As indicated, there is confusion in the area regarding the Pound River Dam and Reservoir and another project now proposed upstream. This second Flood Control Reservoir would be on the North Fork of Pound River and above the town of Pound. It would be much better for this new project—the subject of another bill I have introduced—to be referred to as the "Pound Dam and Reservoir" since it would protect the town of Pound.

Passage of H. R. 109, then, would officially designate the Pound River facility as the "John W. Flannagan Dam and Reservoir." Any law, regulation, map, document, record or other paper of the United States would refer to it by such name. Naturally, the public will soon refer to the "Flannagan Dam and Reservoir."

The Corps of Engineers of the Department of the Army, and the Board on Geographic Names of the Department of Interior, have no objections to the passage of this bill. Copies of their report on the bill are available to the subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, I'm sure that you and perhaps other members of this subcommittee and the Public Works Committee recall the late Congressman John W. Flannagan and his great service to the people of his district, Virginia, and the Nation. I urge you to favorably report H.R. 109 to the full committee, and I certainly hope it will be reported to the House.

We can honor the memory of an able public servant, an outstanding Member of Congress, and beloved citizen of Virginia by approval of this legislation to designate the Pound River project as the "John W. Flannagan Dam and Reservoir."

Mr. DAVIS. Colonel Nauman, could you state what this is about?

STATEMENT OF COL. ARTHUR C. NAUMAN, ASSISTANT CHIEF OF CIVIL WORKS, CORPS OF ENGINEERS—Resumed

Colonel NAUMAN. Yes, sir. It is an authorized reservoir in the Pound River near Bartlick, Dickenson County, Va. The bill under consideration would name the dam and reservoir the "John W. Flannagan Dam and Reservoir" in honor of the late Congressman from Virginia.

Mr. DAVIS. That is right. I think many of us remember Mr. Flannagan. He passed away in 1955. He came to Congress in the 72d session and he was reelected subsequently to the 80th session and served on the House Agriculture Committee. He is deceased and the dam has been authorized. Under our precedent we never authorized the naming of a dam for a living person, but there is no objection from anybody, or any of the neighbors, or anyone else, to this.

I wonder if we could not put this in our bill?

Mr. SMITH. I move the subcommittee report the bill.

Mr. MACK. Second the motion.

Mr. DAVIS. All those in favor let it be known by saying "aye"; those opposed, "no."

The ayes have it and it is so ordered. Of course, that carries with it the motion that the Chair take all necessary steps to bring it to the Consent Calendar.

Thank you very much, gentlemen.

We meet again on the 26th.

(Whereupon, at 11:50 a.m., the subcommittee adjourned until 10 a.m., Tuesday, May 26, 1959.)

RIVER AND HARBOR AND FLOOD CONTROL OMNIBUS BILL, 1959

TUESDAY, MAY 26, 1959

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to adjournment, at 10:15 a.m., on Tuesday, May 26, 1959, in room 1302, New House Office Building, Hon. Clifford Davis (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Mr. DAVIS. The subcommittee will come to order, for the further consideration of projects and survey resolutions to be included in the omnibus bill.

The first project this morning to be considered is the Bardwell Reservoir, Waxahachie Creek, Tex. The sponsor of this project is Mr. Teague of Texas. Mr. Teague had to go to another committee meeting and his administrative assistant Mr. George Fisher, is here and prepared to testify although I am not sure it will be necessary for him to do more than file Mr. Teague's statement for the record, because Col. A. L. Parsons, Assistant Chief of Civil Works of the Corps of Engineers is here and he will make the opening statement, and he is usually pretty thorough about it.

BARDWELL RESERVOIR, WAXAHACHIE CREEK, TEX.

(H. Doc. 424, 85th Cong.)

Mr. DAVIS. All right, Colonel Parsons, we will be glad to hear from you now on this project.

STATEMENT OF LT. COL. A. L. PARSONS, JR., ASSISTANT CHIEF OF CIVIL WORKS, CORPS OF ENGINEERS—Resumed

Colonel PARSONS. Mr. Chairman, this report concerns a reservoir on Waxahachie Creek in the Trinity River Basin, Tex., for both flood control and water conservation.

The favorable report of the Chief of Engineers on Waxahachie Creek was submitted in response to a resolution of the House River and Harbor Committee adopted February 28, 1945, and is printed in House Document 424, 85th Congress, 2d session.

Waxahachie Creek is in the central part of the Trinity River Basin. It is a tributary to Chambers Creek, which joins Richland Creek a short distance above its junction with the Trinity River. The Waxahachie Creek drainage area is 182 square miles, about one-tenth of the tributary watershed.

This is primarily an agricultural area, with recent increases in cattle raising to serve the Dallas-Forth Worth area. The largest cities in the Waxahachie watershed are Waxahachie with a population of over 11,000 in 1950, and Ennis with nearly 8,000.

There is no authorized Federal flood control project on Waxahachie Creek. However, Navarro Mills Reservoir on Richland Creek was authorized in 1954, and there are four other flood control reservoir projects in the Trinity River Basin. Local interests have constructed levees along Waxahachie Creek and the Soil Conservation Service has a program for detention structures in the watershed above the proposed Bardwell site.

Flood producing storms here are of the cloudburst type. Major floods occurred in 1913, 1936, 1942, and 1945. The average annual damages due to flooding are estimated at $465,300.

In addition to flood protection, local interests have requested that storage be provided for water conservation if a reservoir is built. The Trinity River Authority has stated that it will enter into an agreement to provide the local cooperation required for the inclusion of this storage.

The Chief of Engineers recommends construction of Bardwell Dam at mile 6 on Waxahachie Creek with a capacity of 79,600 acre-feet for flood control, 29,500 acre-feet for water conservation, and 8,700 acre-feet for sedimentation.

The estimated first cost of the improvement would be $6,992,000, and the annual maintenance $40,000. The average annual charges would be $290,500.

The average annual benefits are $236,750 from flood damages prevented and $82,000 from water supply, for a total of $318,750.

The benefit-cost ratio is 1.1 to 1.

Prior to construction local interests must give assurances that they will obtain the necessary water rights and will contribute the part of the first cost and annual operation and maintenance allocated to water conservation presently estimated at 27 percent, which amount to $1,888,000 and $11,000, respectively.

It is further recommended that local interests be permitted to contribute their share of the construction cost: (*a*) In a lump sum prior to construction; or (*b*) annually during construction in amounts proportional to the Federal appropriation; or (*c*) in equal annual payments, including interest during construction and on the unpaid balance, within the economic life of the project, but not to exceed 50 years from the first storage of water for any purpose.

Also, that they be permitted to contribute their share of the operation and maintenance cost either annually as incurred, or in lump sum on a present-worth basis.

The Governor of Texas approved the project, subject to the limitation of the conservation storage to 29,500 acre-feet, and coordination during design with the Soil Conservation Service.

The Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture offered no objection to the project.

The Bureau of the Budget had no objection to the submission of the report to the Congress.

That concludes my statement, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DAVIS. Now, Colonel, the record will show the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture, the Federal Power Commission, the State of Texas, the Chief of Engineers, and the Bureau of the Budget are all in accord. Just as an aside I think last year this project passed the Senate; is that right?

Mr. BRENNAN. It passed the Senate, Mr. Chairman, but it did not quite reach here before the omnibus bill was passed out.

Mr. DAVIS. That is right, and we did not want to make it a special project under our rules. But it has passed the Senate. Are there any questions on this? If not, thank you, Colonel Parsons. The prepared statement of our colleague the Honorable Olin E. Teague, of Texas, may be filed in the record at this point without objection. This statement is being presented by the administrative assistant to Mr. Teague, Mr. Fisher. Thank you, Mr. Fisher.

(The prepared statement of Mr. Teague is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE, OF TEXAS

BARDWELL RESERVOIR

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate very much being afforded the opportunity to appear here today. As you are well aware, I am requesting your favorable consideration in the authorization of the construction of a flood control project in the form of a multiple purpose structure on the Waxahachie Creek, Tex., as a part of the overall plan of improvement for the Trinity River and tributaries, Texas. The structure would be known as the Bardwell Reservoir, and your committee has been furnished copies of reports which were printed as House Document 424 of the 85th Congress.

Mr. Chairman, there are several cities in my district, namely Ennis, Waxahachie, and Corsicana who will benefit greatly from the proposed construction. The city to benefit most directly would be Ennis. At the present time the water supply for Ennis is secured from three woodbine wells at a depth of 1,800 feet. At one point during last summer, the water level in two of these wells dropped to 50 feet, making it necessary for the city to drop the pumps in the wells in order to secure water. The capacity of the pumps are 500 gallons per minute and during the aforementioned period, the pumps worked only at 150 gallons per minute. This operation is costly, and the dropping of the pumps at best, could afford only temporary relief.

The city of Ennis has already gone on record as to their willingness to bear the local costs on this recommended construction, but time is an element. Unless this city of approximately 10,000 people secures a surface water supply within the near future, they will be forced to ration water or find an emergency water supply which will only add to the cost of the final solution of their problem.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that you and the other members of this committee are well aware of the seriousness of the water situation in Texas and this recommended project will be a big step in solving some of the problems facing us today in our State.

I introduced H.R. 273 in this Congress for the purpose of authorizing this project, and I earnestly request that you include this project in the omnibus bill which you currently have under consideration.

WALNUT CREEK BASIN, CALIF. (H. DOC. 76, 86TH CONG.)

Mr. DAVIS. The next project we have for consideration is sponsored by Mr. Baldwin, our colleague on this committee. Mr. Baldwin and I talked about this project early in January and I told our good friend because he is a good friend if any project got in this bill his most assuredly would. So I hope the committee will go along with it. I wish you would describe the Walnut Creek Basin, Colonel Parsons.

Colonel PARSONS. The project under consideration, Mr. Chairman, is a channel rectification and levee plan for prevention of flood damage along Walnut Creek including the urban areas of Walnut Creek, Concord, and Pacheco. The study was authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1950.

The Walnut Creek Basin is located about 15 miles east of San Francisco Bay within commuting distance of all cities in the metropolitan area. The basin is rapidly developing from an agricultural to a suburban area. The cities of Walnut Creek and Concord had estimated populations in 1957 of 27,000 and 8,500, respectively.

Walnut Creek is formed by the junction of San Ramon and Las Trampas Creeks in the town of Walnut Creek.

Floods in the basin result from intense winter rainstorms and high flows ordinarily last only a few hours. Serious floods occurred in 1938, 1950, 1952, and 1955. The 1955 flood, which was the largest of these, caused damages estimated at nearly $1.5 million. Nearly half the flood plain under consideration lies within urban areas. The threat to human life is great although no lives have been lost in floods to date. Average annual flood damages based on expected future conditions without flood protection are estimated at $1,187,000.

In analyzing the flood problem, consideration was given to reservoir storage, channel improvement, levees, and various combinations thereof. Channel improvement in combination with levees was found to provide the most economical protection.

The Chief of Engineers recommends improvement of 14.1 miles of channel and construction of 11.8 miles of levee, 4 drop structures, and 4 pumping stations. The improvements would supplement the existing project of the U.S. Soil Conservation Service and incorporate channel improvements constructed or planned by local interests.

Local interests will be required to provide lands, easements and rights-of-way, hold and save the United States free from damages, make all alterations and relocations except railroads, and maintain and operate the project. They must also make a cash contribution of 7.4 percent of the construction cost, presently estimated at $1,440,000, either in advance or prior to portions of the construction. Local interests have indicated their willingness to meet these requirements.

The recommended improvements would provide for protection against floods of a frequency of about once in 100 years, except in the upper reaches where the improvements constructed by local interests are designed to provide protection against floods of 50-year frequency.

The estimated first cost of the improvements is $24,360,000. Of this amount $17,980,000 is Federal and $6,380,000 is non-Federal, including the cash contribution of $1,440,000. The annual charges are $985,000, including $125,000 for maintenance.

The average annual benefits for flood damage prevention and increased land use are estimated to be $1,282,000. The benefit-cost ratio is 1.3 to 1.

The Bureau of the Budget and other Federal agencies offer no objection to the project. The State of California favors its construction.

Mr. DAVIS. All of the agencies, the Bureau of the Budget, the Corps of Engineers, the State of California and everybody connected with it has favorably reported this project.

Mr. Baldwin, do you have any additional statements you would like to make?

Mr. BALDWIN. Yes, Mr. Chairman. I would just like to make a very brief statement. The Corps of Engineers summary was based on the survey which was completed in 1957, as I recall it. Since that time the worst flood in the history of the project actually occurred, which was in April of 1958. John McFall and I were designated by the chairman of the Public Works Committee during the Easter recess to go and make a survey of the flood situation in California.

In that flood over 1,000 homes were flooded. The creek reached the highest point it had ever reached up to that time, and there was tremendous damage both to homes and businesses. It is becoming a more critical situation each year because of the rapid growth of the area. It has been estimated that the area has 120,000 people in the watershed now and within 6 years it may well double that to a total of 240,000. So it is becoming progressively more urgent each year.

I appreciate the fact that the committee in connection with its visit to California 2 years ago, the subcommittee headed at that time by Congressman Smith, were kind enough to drive through Walnut Creek watershed in connection with our trip to a hearing at Martinez, so the members of the subcommittee had a first-hand opportunity to see the area and the rapid suburban growth. I appreciate your kindness in scheduling these hearings, and I hope the committee will approve the project.

Mr. DAVIS. Thank you, Mr. Baldwin. I am sure that all of the Members are entirely sympathetic and are certainly interested in the splendid statement that you have made in addition to the excellent statement by Colonel Parsons, the representative of the Corps of Engineers.

Colonel PARSONS. Mr. Chairman, if I may I would like to bring to the attention of the committee some changed conditions since our report. Since the time that the report was submitted, local interests have constructed about 1,200 feet of channel improvements above the town of Walnut Creek which had been intended for Federal construction, and they have also indicated there is a possibility that they may not construct a 900 foot portion of the channel in Walnut Creek that we had thought that they would. So the Federal cost remains essentially the same but the plan is not quite as presented.

We think that the Chief of Engineers should be authorized to construct the portion of the project within the city of Walnut Creek the local interests may not construct, even though they had planned to at the time of the report.

Mr. DAVIS. Does that meet with your understanding and approval, Mr. Baldwin?

Mr. BALDWIN. As I understand it, Colonel, it is just a transfer from one portion of the project which the Corps of Engineers were going to construct, which has already been constructed by the local interests.

Colonel PARSONS. Yes, sir.

Mr. BALDWIN. So in lieu of that you propose that the Corps of Engineers will construct another portion which had already been scheduled to be constructed by the local interests?

Colonel PARSONS. That is correct.

Mr. BALDWIN. It is just a transfer.

Colonel PARSONS. Yes.

Mr. BALDWIN. I have no objection to that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Chairman, I was a member of the committee which inspected the area 2 years ago. I was very much impressed by the merits of this project.

MOJAVE RIVER, CALIF., PROJECT

Mr. DAVIS. If there is nothing further on this project we pass to the Mojave River in California, which is Mr. Sheppard's project. Mr. Sheppard called me late yesterday afternoon. As we know he has been handling the military appropriations bill, and they have worked since January 11 steadily on that bill. Despite the fact that he is completely worn out, as I can well imagine, he stated that he certainly did not want this committee to feel he was showing us any disrespect by not being here, but under the circumstances with his having all of these military appropriations hearings, he stated that he hoped we would go ahead and take up the project.

We certainly respect his attitude as expressed by telephone. It is not a big project, and it has been favorably approved by the Corps of Engineers, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, the Federal Power Commission, the Chief of Engineers, and the Bureau of the Budget.

So we will let the record show that Mr. Sheppard of California, our colleague, was intensely interested in this project.

Colonel PARSONS. Mr. Chairman, this project, in San Bernardino County, Calif., is for the partial protection of urban and agricultural areas in the Mojave River Basin from floodflows in the Mojave River.

The favorable report of the Chief of Engineers was made in response to the Flood Control Act of August 28, 1937. It has not yet been printed as a congressional document.

The Mojave River rises in the San Bernardino mountains, and is forced by the junction of Deep Creek and West Fork. It flows down out of the mountains and through the Mojave Desert, past Victorville and Barstow, and into Soda Lake, a distance of 150 miles.

This valley is subject to recurring damaging floods. The average width of the overflow area is only about one-half mile, but contains over 18,000 acres of agricultural land. The cities of Barstow and Victorville, with populations of about 8,000 and 5,000 in 1956, both contain residential, business and industrial property, and major railroad yards, subject to flooding. Highways and railroads parallel the river for many miles.

The largest floods during the period of record occurred in 1910, 1916, 1921, 1938, and 1943. The largest, in 1938, caused over $2 million in damages. At present values the damage would be 3 to 4 times as great. The average annual damage from future floods is estimated to be $370,000.

The cost of providing complete protection from floods was found so great that such a project was found unjustified. The recommended plan will prevent about two-thirds of the average annual damages, or about $241,000 worth.

The Chief of Engineers recommends construction of a reservoir for flood control near the mouth of West Fork. The contemplated reser-

voir would have a capacity of 30,200 acre-feet for flood control and 10,000 acre-feet sediment reserve. The first cost is estimated at $3,070,000. The annual charges would be $129,700, including $18,700 for maintenance and operation. The average annual benefits, all from flood damages prevented, are estimated at $241,000.

The benefit-cost ratio is 1.86 to 1.

Local interests will be required to hold and save the United States free from damages from water rights claims; to prevent encroachment by zoning or other measures on the existing downstream channel; and, maintain channel capacities of not less than 20,000 cubic feet per second through improved areas.

The State of California commented favorably on the report.

The Departments of Interior, Commerce, and Agriculture had no objection to the project.

The Bureau of the Budget offered no objection to the submission of the report to Congress.

Mr. DAVIS. Are there any questions on the part of any members?

Mr. MUMMA. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. DAVIS. Are there any other questions? If not, thank you, Colonel Parsons.

Colonel PARSONS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

FAVORABLE FLOOD CONTROL SURVEY RESOLUTIONS

Mr. DAVIS. Gentlemen, you have before you a list of flood control resolutions all of which have been approved by the Bureau of the Budget. To Mr. Mumma and Mr. Johnson I may explain we had a rule in this committee that we would not approve a survey resolution which cost over $40,000, but last year Mr. Broomfield and one or two others over here had surveys which went beyond that figure, so we thought in view of the so-called increased prices everywhere that we should go up to $65,000 to take care of the one or two very, very meritorious projects.

If I may make the general statement at this time, Mr. Brennan will take these up one at a time. You have the memorandum in front of you with the projects listed and Mr. Brennan wil run down this list. You will notice six of them have already been approved by the other body. That is correct, Mr. Brennan, is it not?

Mr. BRENNAN. Yes, sir. Either that, or they are already a part of a study under a previously approved resolution of this committee.

Mr. DAVIS. And that requires no additional authorized cost by this committee, gentleman. But we have always felt over on this side that we should maintain the integrity of our own colleagues and a man on this side should get whatever credit he is entitled to, especially as the Senate, on the other side, has already put it in for approval.

Mr. Brennan, will you take these up and if there are any questions on the part of anybody they will be able to ask them as you go along. I suggest you start with Document No. 1006 by Mr. Norrell and then go right down the line.

Remember these have been approved by the Corps of Engineers and by the Bureau of the Budget. Just give us a quick statement, Mr. Brennan, as to what this resolution would do.

Mr. BRENNAN. Yes, Mr. Chairman. I might say by the way that the total cost of these resolutions range from no cost, as was indicated by the chairman in the case of the first six listed, to $65,000, and they are arranged in the order of increased cost as you look down through the list.

The total cost of these resolutions is $592,000, or an average of $27,000 per report, approximately.

I might say also that many of these have come about because of the floods in Ohio and Indiana which occurred this last winter and early spring and resulted in great damages. The first one is a $10,000 study of Pine Bluff, Hardin drain, Arkansas, which is a part of the Arkansas River Basin. There have been previous reports made on this, but there is a situation which has arisen where local people feel they would like to have a review of the previous report, and the Army Engineers recommend such a review.

On any of these I have more detailed information if any of the members want to question me about them.

The next one is the Kokosing River Basin, Ohio, $15,000. That is in the area that was severely damaged by the floods of this spring.

The next one is the Kanawha River, W. Va., $20,000. That also is in the same general area that was subjected to last spring's floods.

Mr. SMITH. Do these resolutions carry over from one Congress to the next, Mr. Brennan?

Mr. BRENNAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMITH. You mean if I introduced a resolution in the 85th Congress we can still pass it in the 86th Congress?

Mr. BRENNAN. Yes, sir. Actually the process is merely for the Member to ask the committee to pass a resolution. The committee sends the request to the Corps of Engineers and they reply to the committee. So the resolution is not drawn up until the committee considers it, as you are today. So, the resolution does not carry over, but it is the request that carries over.

Mr. MUMMA. It is approved by the Appropriations Committee, is it not? All these amounts go to the Appropriations Committee for funds, do they not?

Mr. DAVIS. That is correct. And they get a lump sum and then the Corps of Engineers must determine the priority with which they will examine these projects.

Mr. BRENNAN. Continuing on in the list, the next one is Killbuck Creek, Ohio, which is in the same general area as the Kokosing River, and was subject to floods last spring. The cost is $20,000.

Mr. DAVIS. Do any of you have any objections or questions about any of these, in view of the fact that the Corps of Engineers and the Chief of Engineers have recommended them and the Bureau of the Budget have approved their submission to this committee?

Mr. BRENNAN. These resolutions, Mr. Chairman, are only those which have been favorably recommended. These are instances where a review study has been favorably recommended by the Chief of Engineers and such a recommendation has been submitted to this committee in response to the committee's request for comments. So all of these are favorable and they all comply with the ground rules which the committee has followed in the past.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Chairman, just to refresh the committee's mind I would like to ask Mr. Brennan this question. What is the amount of money that is represented by projects already approved for surveys?

Mr. BRENNAN. Do you mean the total cost?

Mr. MACK. Surveys that have been approved but for which appropriations have not yet been made.

Mr. BRENNAN. Well, the total cost of all surveys which are now active and have not been started, or which are on the books as it were—and the Corps of Engineers may want to correct me—is $25 million, speaking from memory. Approximately one-half of that has been funded, leaving another half yet to be funded.

Mr. MACK. In other words, $12½ million of projects are still pending appropriations?

Mr. BRENNAN. Yes, sir. It varies all the way from money to start a survey report, to money to complete a survey report, to money to carry it on.

Mr. MACK. In our past experience at about what rate does the Appropriations Committee provide money for these surveys?

Mr. BRENNAN. It provides money for about 25 percent of the total balance that is outstanding at the beginning of every year. For example, there are approximately 1,000 survey reports which are on the books of the Corps of Engineers in various stages of process, from no progress, to those started, and those nearing completion. In the last several years the Appropriations Committee put in enough money to carry on to some extent at least 200 to 250 of those.

Mr. MACK. In other words, in about 4 years if no more were approved it would be cleaned up?

Mr. BRENNAN. That is correct.

Mr. BALDWIN. Will the gentleman yield? Are you referring just to a summary of flood control surveys, or both flood control and river and harbor surveys?

Mr. BRENNAN. Both. I do not have the breakdown in my mind as between them.

Mr. BALDWIN. Thank you.

Mr. DAVIS. I respectfully submit it is proper to include additional surveys which have been recommended and approved by both the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget so that they can assume their place of priority in the list. Because, as we know, we have had these Ohio and Indiana floods, as well as floods in other places. As was said, there are some of these that go way back in time and they may never be surveyed and no work will be done on them, but there are some new ones that come along that may take precedence.

Mr. THOMPSON. May I ask a question?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. On the work done, has the Corps of Engineers studied this backlog of approved survey projects to determine whether or not perhaps small watershed programs have not obviated the necessity for the surveying of some of the older ones?

Mr. BRENNAN. You mean under Public Law 566?

Mr. THOMPSON. Either that or any other changed circumstances which would render a survey now on an approved project of let us say 5 years ago, unnecessary.

Mr. BRENNAN. That is something of an automatic process, Mr. Thompson. There are several steps. First, at the beginning of each year when the Corps of Engineers in the field prepares its budget, each district engineer looks over their survey reports which they have on their books. Subject to the possibility of have criteria about no new starts, he in substance examines all of the ones he has and determines which of those, from the knowledge of his people of local conditions, should be carried or should at least be started.

He does not go out and look at every single one but generally he has information in the district office which permits him to make some kind of decision as to what surveys he would like to have money for.

That goes on up through the usual channels and finally it goes through the Chief of Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget to the Appropriations Committee. For example, if he does ask for an amount of money to start a survey and he gets that sum in the appropriation bill, and he finds out after starting it, and after he gets far enough along in the study to learn there is no more justification for it, or that the original conditions have changed, then he does not spend the rest of the money but he submits what they call a brief report which in effect closes out the report authority at a minimum cost.

Mr. THOMPSON. Considering that you have a $12½ million backlog at the present time, which I think you indicated, at the beginning of this fiscal year how much of that money was canceled out? How many such projects has the Corps of Engineers canceled out because of their being unnecessary in their opinion now?

Mr. BRENNAN. The ones that are canceled out would only be those which are submitted in the form of brief unfavorable reports, two- or three-page reports, canceling them out. I do not have the figure as to how many of those there are. There are still a lot on the books which are not canceled out because the Corps of Engineers did not get around to examining them. The same as with construction projects that are not automatically deauthorized. They stay on the books until the Corps of Engineers gets money to look at them.

Mr. THOMPSON. So that of that $12½ million you say some percentage of that amount must be looked at again, although they will not be canceled out at this time.

Mr. BRENNAN. They will be looked at in a minimum way. They are not precluded from being looked at, but they may stay there for years.

Mr. THOMPSON. So actually the $12½ million is the latest figure in terms of what has to be done?

Mr. BRENNAN. Yes. Except that the rate of reports coming in each year, new ones, in comparison to the ones being finished, has for some time kept a balance and the amount has been kept fairly constant. Some of the new ones may be more justified for early prosecution than some of the ones which have been lying on the shelf. It is a constant turnover.

Mr. THOMPSON. As we go along, unless they are canceled out, the percentage of projects which will never be gone into again increases percentagewise compared to the backlog total, does it not?

Mr. BRENNAN. No, because at the same time that that is happening, new projects and new reports are being authorized whereby they take their place on the list. For example, a report will be submitted, a

favorable report, and a new authorization might be given on a new survey which would take its place. Therefore, the percentage which the unfavorable ones, we will say, bear, can remain the same. I do not know whether it does exactly.

Mr. THOMPSON. In terms of years what would be an old project, included in the $12½ million backlog? How many years have passed since they first authorized those which nothing was done on?

Mr. BRENNAN. The maximum would be 32 years.

Mr. THOMPSON. Do you have some that old?

Mr. BRENNAN. There are some still remaining, surveys authorized by the old 308 reports, dating back to 1927. There are only a few left and there has been work done on them, but they have never been submitted for one reason or another. But that is the extreme.

Mr. THOMPSON. But you are carrying some of those projects from the remote past, included in the $12½ million, are you not?

Mr. BRENNAN. Yes. That is correct.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Chairman, some of those should be cleared out by a positive approach to the survey of projects so that it will not look so bad from the standpoint of the backlog which exists on paper, and which actually does not exist.

Mr. DAVIS. If I may make a very quick and brief statement, we are making progress because we are catching up. More money has been appropriated in the last session or two for these surveys than in other years. You will remember back in Mr. Dondero's time, and later, all of us have talked about deauthorizing some of these old projects, but we never got around to it because nobody wants one of them deauthorized despite the fact that nothing ever will be done on it. Maybe the Member who introduced the resolution way back yonder has been defeated, or died, or what not, but his successor says, "No. That will be a reflection on me if you deauthorize it."

So, as an explanation of this, Mr. Mumma, we just have never been able to come up with it. Isn't that right, Mr. Schwengel? But, in effect, we are gaining on the whole situation because they are giving more money to the Army Engineers for these surveys and we are screening them and not putting in too many of them, and the Corps of Engineers are holding back on their recommendations.

That is about right, is it not, General Person?

General PERSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Brennan, you said about $3 million is appropriated annually to carry out these surveys. Is the $3 million earmarked for specific projects or is part of it earmarked and a certain part left for the Army Engineers to use as they elect?

Mr. BRENNAN. Those are, in effect, all earmarked, Mr. Mack, because although it is appropriated as part of a lump sum which covers engineering studies and research, they are covered by a detailed list of individual reports submitted to the Appropriations Committee, and which are screened and approved by the Bureau of the Budget. So that, although the Corps of Engineers is not legally bound to use the $3 million or any part on a certain report, they are more or less committed to it.

The only way they can change that money allocation is in the situation where a report might be retarded due to circumstances which developed during the year and there will be some excess money left on it, and they can switch it to other reports.

Mr. MACK. Then the excess money can be spent on any project the Army Engineers deem worthy?

Mr. BRENNAN. That is correct, but the amount is relatively small in comparison to the total.

Mr. DAVIS. General Person, would you like to make a direct statement?

STATEMENT OF BRIG. GEN. JOHN L. PERSON, ASSISTANT CHIEF OF ENGINEERS FOR CIVIL WORKS, CORPS OF ENGINEERS—Resumed

General PERSON. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I might elaborate on it. As Mr. Brennan said, legally we can use our lump sum appropriations on any survey we want to, but if we deviated from the list which we furnished to the Appropriations Committee materially, then we are not going to stay in business. We do have authority and use the authority to transfer funds from one to another so that you are going steadily. It may be for one reason or another, whether bad weather or lack of local interest, or a reason of any sort, such as some progress faster than others so that they have more need for the money—and we do that. But we do not ever start a new study which has not been previously defended before the Congress, without getting permission in writing from the chairman of both Appropriations Committees.

We have not done it in the current fiscal year. We did it on two emergency projects in fiscal 1958, but not at all in 1958, and do not intend to do it in 1960.

So although legally and technically we can use the money as we see fit, practically we must stick as closely as practicable to what we testified to Congress on.

Mr. DAVIS. Thank you. The Chair expresses deep appreciation to the members of this committee for their punctual attendance. On tomorrow if everybody will be here promptly at 10 o'clock, General Person is going to make a general statement about one river basin and then we will have a half dozen more on which his statement will be cumulative. General Person, you will be here tomorrow, won't you?

General PERSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. DAVIS. Gentlemen, we are all so pressed for time. Tomorrow if we are all punctual I think we can be out of here in 25 minutes. It will not take you too long to explain the one basin, General, will it? Thank you, gentlemen. We will go into executive session now if there be no objection.

(Whereupon, at 10:45 a.m., the subcommittee went into executive session.)

(The following was furnished for insertion:)

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN W. PAT JENNINGS, NINTH DISTRICT, VIRGINIA, IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 106, A BILL TO AUTHORIZE CONSTRUCTION OF A FLOOD CONTROL DAM ON THE NORTH FORK OF POUND RIVER NEAR THE TOWN OF POUND, WISE COUNTY, VA.

This statement is submitted to you in support of legislation I have proposed to authorize construction of a flood control project on the North Fork of Pound River near the town of Pound, Wise County, Va.

It is my hope that you can favorably recommend this project to the House Public Works Committee and ask that it be included in the omnibus rivers and harbors bill that is to be considered.

H.R. 106 was introduced on January 7, 1959, in anticipation of a favorable report from the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, on the proposed North Fork of Pound flood control reservoir. Unfortunately, the report has not yet been transmitted to Congress although it is near completion and should be received within the next day or so. It is now under review in the Bureau of the Budget.

Therefore, I ask that you recommend this project to the full committee for inclusion in the omnibus bill.

The Corps of Engineers has completed its investigation of flood control needs in the Big Sandy River Basin in Virginia, Kentucky, and West Virginia. The report of the Engineers contains the results of this investigation and survey, and includes a recommendation for the construction of the North Fork of Pound River project.

I have contacted the Bureau of the Budget and have received assurances that its review of the report will be expedited so that the Corps of Engineers, through the Secretary of the Army, can soon submit the final document to Congress.

The district engineer of the Corps' Huntington district recommended the North Fork facility as a modification of the existing flood protection plan in the Big Sandy Basin. The division engineer of the Ohio River division concurs in the recommendations of the district engineer.

The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, in approving the recommendations for this new reservoir included the following statement in its summary of the action taken in the Big Sandy Basin flood control investigation:

"The Board recommends modification of the general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the Ohio River Basin, to include North Fork Dam, about 95 feet high, with a reservoir having a total capacity of about 11,300 acre-feet, on the North Fork of Pound River, Va., a tributary of the Levisa Fork; generally in accordance with the plans of the district engineer and with such modifications thereof as in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers may be advisable; at an estimated cost to the United States of $3,681,000 for construction and $20,000 annually for maintenance and operation in addition to that now required."

The estimated benefit-to-cost ratio of this project is 1.6 to 1.

As I have stated, the various comments on this report are generally favorable; two of the other projects in the present flood protection plan are now in the planning state—the Pound River Reservoir in Dickenson County, Va., and the Fishtrap Reservoir in the adjoining Kentucky county.

The North Fork of Pound River Dam and Reservoir would protect the town of Pound and downstream areas. Actually, it would be located approximately 1 mile above this town and would give the flood relief that has been needed for many years. I have in my files, and the Corps of Engineers has also compiled a similar record, the history of floods in the town of Pound. I will mention only one of these floods, that of 1957.

According to the engineers' estimates, damage at Pound in 1957 was over $1 million. The average annual flood damages at Pound are estimated at $159,000. The residents of Pound and those downstream in the basin, live in daily fear of another flood similar to that of 1957. This proposed project would protect the town of Pound and be of great help in bringing relief to other towns and communities along the Pound, Russell Fork, Levisa Fork, Big Sandy, and even the Ohio Rivers.

It is literally a matter of life and death, of existence in fear of floods or with some degree of security, for the people concerned with this proposed project. I urgently bring it to your attention and ask that you recommend its inclusion in the omnibus bill that is to be considered.

RIVER AND HARBOR AND FLOOD CONTROL OMNIBUS BILL, 1959

WEDNESDAY, MAY 27, 1959

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to adjournment, at 10:05 a.m., on Wednesday, May 26, 1959, in room 1302, New House Office Building, Hon. Clifford Davis (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Mr. DAVIS. If there is no objection, we are to meet at 11 o'clock this morning in the House so we will have to get busy here. General Person, will come around, please? As we stated yesterday, this morning we are considering the necessary increase in monetary authorization for river basins. If General Person will give us a statement on one river basin then the same philosophy and the same reasoning will apply to all the rest and then we can dispose of them in that way. So, General Person, will you just take the top one?

STATEMENT OF BRIG. GEN. JOHN L. PERSON, ASSISTANT CHIEF OF ENGINEERS FOR CIVIL WORKS, CORPS OF ENGINEERS—Resumed

General PERSON. Yes, sir. I might take the Columbia, which is a typical basin in which we are in trouble. In the Columbia the authorized plan provides for the construction of 14 reservoirs, of which 5 have been completed, 4 are under construction, and 5 are in the planning stage. It also provides for the construction of nine local protection projects, of which one has been completed, four are now underway, and four have not been started.

Mr. MACK. General, you said 14 and you mentioned only 13.

General PERSON. This is 14 reservoirs in the Columbia Basin.

Mr. MACK. You said there were 14 altogether and that 4 were completed and 4 underconstruction and 5 in the planning stage.

General PERSON. No, sir. Five completed, four under construction, and five in the planning stage.

Mr. MACK. Thank you.

COLUMBIA BASIN

General PERSON. The total estimated Federal cost of the Columbia Basin project is now estimated at $1,400 million. The total monetary authorization so far provided in nine acts of Congress from 1938 to 1958 is $575,300,000. In the approved budget for fiscal year 1960 we have funds requested for Hills Creek Reservoir, Oreg., Fall Creek Reservoir, Oreg., Cougar Reservoir, Oreg., Blue River Reservoir,

Oreg., Willamette River bank protection, John Day Dam, the Dalles Dam, Jackson Hole, Wyo., and the Columbia River local protection project.

We have sufficient authorization to cover the 1960 budget requests. That is true in all of our basins. However, in 1961 our program for those same reservoirs contemplates an expenditure of $81,500,000. The remaining monetary authorization will only be $57,500,000, so we need $24 million additional authorization in fiscal 1961 in order to request the needed appropriations.

In 1962 we have a program amounting to $65 million, so that if no authorizing legislation is enacted we will be $90 million short in fiscal year 1962 and $139 million short in fiscal year 1963, which would mean we would only get two-thirds of the money we need in 1961 and nothing in 1962 or 1963.

Mr. DAVIS. General, you were here on yesterday when we discussed the advisability of extending these authorizations for a period of 2 years which would take it through 1961 and 1962, thinking that we would have another bill in 1962, and recognizing that the public generally, when they see these authorization bills, translate that into appropriated dollars and cents.

The sense of the committee yesterday was that we thought it was advisable to make this extension to cover a period of 2 years and then come back in 1962. Will you address your remarks along that line to see how much will be needed in monetary authorization through 1962 rather than 1963, and then we can come in in 1962, if we are around here—somebody will be—and take another look at it.

General PERSON. Yes. We recommended, of course, legislation that would take us through 1963. The only reason we did that was because over the past years the omnibus bills have been about 3 years apart. Whether it is 2 years or 3 years is purely dependent on the judgment of the committee, recognizing if we make it 2 years we will be back again a year sooner.

Mr. BALDWIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Baldwin.

Mr. BALDWIN. General, actually some of us feel we should be passing omnibus bills more frequently than every 3 years because the biggest gripe we have from people with flood problems all over the country is that even after a survey is completed and ready to go, it might sit for 3 years before we pass on omnibus bill. I would personally like to see us pass an omnibus bill at least every 2 years if not every 1 year, so we do not have that timelag.

General PERSON. I would certainly join you, sir.

Mr. BALDWIN. And this would facilitate making sure we do pass one every 2 years.

Mr. DAVIS. In other words, Mr. Baldwin they will have to come back because they will be out of money.

Mr. BALDWIN. That is right.

Mr. DAVIS. It would be a necessity then.

General PERSON. It would certainly make our lives simpler because as you know when we have a bill every 3 years there is terrific pressure to get every outstanding report in to the Congress so we can hit that omnibus bill; and if we had one every year or two it would simplify things for us tremendously.

Mr. MACK. If Congress makes this a 2-year program instead of a 4-year program authorization, what would be the difference in monetary amounts involved?

General PERSON. If this is a 2-year period, our original figures contemplated the need for $455 million instead of the $866 million needed for a 3-year period. Since that time, however, we have found that in one river basin, the Santa Anna Basin, where we recommended a $2 million increase in authorization we got very excellent bids on the two projects in the basin, so we now no longer need the $2 million, which means the figures now are $453 million for a 2-year period as compared to $864 million for a 3-year period.

Mr. MACK. General, if this money is provided it would merely carry on projects which have already been authorized and would not involve any new authorizations in new work, whether navigation, flood control, hydroelectric power, or anything else?

General PERSON. Absolutely. It authorizes nothing whatever except the appropriation of additional funds to carry on projects which themselves are already authorized. There will be no additional work of any nature authorized.

Mr. MACK. These projects are already in almost all cases under construction and unless there is monetary authorization provided the certainty exists that many of those projects will be stopped in their tracks and great unemployment and disorganization result. Is that true?

General PERSON. Yes, sir. As you know, Mr. Mack, the delay in the passage of the last omnibus bill resulted in our getting caught on two projects and having to carry funds over which we would normally have used but which we could not use because the authorization was not yet enacted. So it would mean shutting down projects if we do not get the additional money for authorization.

Mr. MACK. And that applies to all of these river basins. I think 10 in number, as well as just the Columbia River Basin?

General PERSON. Yes, sir. There are a total of 10 which will be in trouble by 1963 and 4 will be in trouble in 1961.

We have recommended that the legislation authorize the completion of the Barkley Dam in Kentucky, which was a single project, and there are only two single projects I know of that were subject to the monetary authorization limit. We feel it would be well to authorize completion of that project. This will require $72 million additional monetary authorization over the figure of $453 million given for the 2-year period for the other basins involved.

We also recommend that the existing authorizations for the Arkansas River Basin be combined into a single plan of development for administrative purposes only. It would not change in any way the authorized projects but it would merely combine the two authorizations into one plan.

Mr. MACK. General, the report has been under consideration for some time in the field and is now in the process of coming up to Washington, D.C., relating to the Columbia River, and that does involve some new authorizations; does it not?

General PERSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. MACK. And that is separate from the issues involved in this particular authorization?

General PERSON. Oh, completely so. Yes, sir.

Mr. DAVIS. You will supply for the record the necessary authorization amounts through 1962 on each of these then, General?

General PERSON. Yes, sir; we will.

(The information is as follows:)

Comprehensive river basin plans—Monetary authorizations required to cover a period of 2 years (fiscal years 1961–62)

[Thousands of dollars]

River basins	Available monetary authorization	Proposed and actual funding through fiscal year 1962	Deficit monetary authorization	Additional monetary authorization required
Arkansas, flood control	$224,773	$258,865.8	−$34,092.8	$35,000
Arkansas, navigation	136,000	194,882.0	−58,882.0	59,000
Central and southern Florida	83,300	84,122.0	−822.0	1,000
Columbia	575,300	664,446.7	−89,146.7	90,000
Los Angeles	254,041	283,620.0	−29,579.0	30,000
Lower Cumberland (Barkley Dam)	36,000	109,190.0	−73,190.0	[1] 74,000
Missouri	1,039,094	1,170,402.1	−131,308.1	132,000
White	226,000	257,982.2	−31,982.2	32,000
Total additional authorization required for 2-year period				453,000

[1] An additional amount of $72,000,000 would be required to provide for completion of this project.

Mr. DAVIS. Thank you, General. Are there any other questions?

Col. Doswell Gullatt, assistant to the vice president of waterways, Association of American Railroads, has a very long statement here relating to additional authorization for the Arkansas, Columbia, and Missouri Rivers for navigation and other purposes.

Of course you understand, Colonel Gullatt, that years ago these projects were authorized and work has been underway on them. This is simply a matter of extending the authority to keep the work going. Could you summarize your statement for us? Please understand we do not want to cut you off, but the House meets early today on account of the death of Secretary Dulles. So could you possibly summarize this statement?

STATEMENT OF DOSWELL GULLATT, ASSISTANT TO VICE PRESIDENT, WATERWAYS, ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN RAILROADS

Colonel GULLATT. Yes, sir.

Mr. DAVIS. Give us the high spots in it, please, sir.

Colonel GULLATT. If I may, I will try to summarize it, Mr. Chairman. First let me say that I understand what the authorization means and, I think, the purpose of it. As my statement shows, I spent 27 years in the Army in the Corps of Engineers and I am familiar with it. However, I am here to attempt to show this committee that we have three projects which I picked out which are no longer justified. They no longer would be considered by this committee, I believe, as projects which should be built.

I am trying to show the committee that here is a place where much Government funds will be dissipated without economic justification. Now, since you gentlemen here are the authorizing body, or rather you recommend the authorization to the Congress for these funds, I am appealing to you, insofar as navigation on these projects is concerned,

on the ground that you should deny this authorization in order to stop the expenditure of these funds.

I forgot to say at the beginning, my name is Doswell Gullatt and I am here having served 27 years in the corps of the U.S. Army and later having practiced as a consulting engineer in civil life. At present I am assistant to the vice president of the Association of American Railroads. I am appearing for the Association of American Railroads in opposition to the authorization of additional Federal funds for the improvement of certain inland waterways navigation facilities because complete engineering and economic reports fully justifying the projects are either not available or are not current, and, further, because my review of the available data on these projects indicates that no further expenditures for navigation facilities on these projects is justified or should be made by the Federal Government.

That is essentially, in essence, the substance of this paper and the additional papers that I want to introduce in the record. I want to read a couple of these paragraphs to you if I may, sir.

I am appearing before you because the railroads must compete for traffic with water carriers in most parts of the country. The railroads are privately owned and financed in all respects. They own, maintain, and pay taxes on their rights-of-way. The water carriers, on the other hand, enjoy elaborate and expensive rights-of-way which are paid for by the public, including the railroads.

Mr. JONES. May I ask the witness a question at that point?

Colonel GULLATT. Yes.

Mr. JONES. As I understand your statement today, your opposition stems from the fact that navigation is in competition with the railroads; is that correct?

Colonel GULLATT. That is one of our motives in submitting this. Yes. But we are opposing these projects not only because they are in competition to the railroads—because I personally don't object to the competition of the waterways to the railroads if they are justified and are paying their own way. I am objecting to it on the basis that these projects are not justified economically and should not be continued because it is a waste of Federal funds.

Mr. JONES. You have made two different points. The first is that navigation is competitive with the railroads and, secondly, that this project is not economically feasible. Is that right?

Colonel GULLATT. That is right.

Mr. JONES. Which is the predominant thought in your mind that causes you to be here this morning?

Colonel GULLATT. The predominant thought in my mind is I am here because they are not economically justifiable.

Mr. JONES. Has it been your desire to see the fiscal integrity of the Government protected in other regards? How many other reports by this committee have you investigated, Colonel?

Colonel GULLATT. Pending before this committee, I have investigated the Columbia, which is on its way up to this committee.

Mr. JONES. We have several hundred reports before this committee. Did you go over all of them?

Colonel GULLATT. No; I go over all of them that apply to navigation.

Mr. JONES. So actually, then, your inspiration for being here is because this is a project involving navigation?

Colonel GULLATT. Well, it is the only thing I am objecting to.

Mr. JONES. Yes, sir.

Colonel GULLATT. You will find in my report that is the only thing I am objecting to.

Mr. JONES. Your association, as I understand it, testified before the Hoover Commission task force in opposing navigation works and even made the suggestion that we should have some tariff charges made on vessels that are using the inland waterway systems, did you not?

Colonel GULLATT. I believe that is highly desirable; yes, sir.

Mr. JONES. Yes, sir. Thank you.

Mr. DAVIS. Will the gentleman from Alabama yield to me for a moment?

Mr. JONES. Yes, sir.

Mr. DAVIS. It is interesting for me to note because I live in Memphis, Tenn., that the president of the Illinois Central RR., which railroad parallels the Mississippi River from the Gulf of Mexico to Chicago—from New Orleans to Chicago. That railroad is very much interested in the further development of shipping on the Mississippi River because that railroad says it helps business and it helps the connecting lines because they bring down out of the Ohio steel and wire and automobiles and all that sort of thing—heavy commodities—and they are transferred at Memphis and other ports to the railroads going to the far west and going down into Alabama and Florida, etc. So it is rather interesting for me to comment that the president of that railroad paralleling the Mississippi River is interested in navigation on the Mississippi River.

Colonel GULLATT. Mr. Davis, may I ask, sir? Was not that statement made many years ago?

Mr. DAVIS. I could not tell you just when. It has been several years back.

Colonel GULLATT. I do not believe the president of the Illinois Central RR. feels that way now. Many years ago that statement was made, and it has been repeated a number of times.

Mr. JONES. It did not disturb the value of the statement made in 1927, to which Mr. Davis refers.

Colonel GULLATT. I am speaking of the present policy, Mr. Jones. I am trying to interpret the present policy.

Mr. JONES. I understand that.

Colonel GULLATT. Of course, we are continually faced with the statement that waterways help railroads, but, principally, the people who make that statement are not the railroads concerned; it is the waterway people. I think and I hope that this Congress at some not too distant future time will put a users charge on the facilities that the U.S. Government has spent so much in improving in order to make waterways, and make the waterways pay their own way. Then I believe there will be greater free competition all the way around.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Mack.

Mr. MACK. Just to clarify the situation, is it not true that in previous Congresses the district engineers made surveys of all of these authorizations previously made and approved, the district engineers

held public hearings in the field, and the district engineers made reports favorable to the authorization. These reports went through the Rivers and Harbors Board here and then came before the Congress and the Congress, in previous Congresses, authorized all of these projects to which you object, and approved them in all of their detail?

This present bill in no way will modify the previously approved projects, approved by the Corps of Engineers and by the Congress and by the executive agencies of the Government. If that be true, is it not true that your objection should be directed to this new report that is now being prepared rather than to the present authorization which merely continues projects that have already been authorized?

Colonel GULLATT. Mr. Mack, may I answer this question in this way: I am sure I have made mistakes in my lifetime and I am sure most of us here have made mistakes in our lifetimes. I believe that the Congress made a mistake in approving navigation on the Columbia and Snake Rivers, on the Missouri River, and on the Arkansas River. I believe we are prepared—or are in the process of spending $2 billion on the Arkansas River. About 80 percent of it is for navigation, which is not justified; $1,200 million is already approved. Another $800 million, if they extend it, will probably be required. I am appealing to this committee. I believe that this committee made a mistake, if I may put it that way, in approving or recommending the approval of those navigation projects. I believe that the Congress made a mistake approving the project. I am trying to have you reconsider that action. I am trying to get reconsideration of that action.

Mr. MACK. That is what I thought you were attempting to do. If we proceed to review all three of these basin projects you mentioned it will be necessary to go back to the district offices of the Army Engineers and hold public hearings. The reports will have to go through the National Rivers and Harbors Board again and eventually come back before the Congress for review of their new report.

In the meantime there will be no authorizations for any of the projects to proceed on any work. The projects will be held up and nothing will be done and a great number of people will be unemployed.

Colonel GULLATT. May I just caution you on one—which is Ice Harbor on the Snake River. It will be my estimate you will spend at least $15 million to build a lock in Ice Harbor. That could be saved if this committee could take some action to reconsider that portion of the river above Pasco and eliminate that lock, or at least at a minimum, put in permanent logs there instead of putting in machinery and lock leaves. I believe considerable funds could be saved in that way.

They are asking for additional money for the construction of the John Day Dam. Actually, I question the wisdom of it very seriously. We are not opposing it, but I question very seriously the justification for that; but that part of the job is so far along, nothing can be done about it. That is a navigation job. I question very seriously that there will ever be enough traffic to justify it.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Gullatt, I read your statement about some of the charges concerning economic justification and they are pretty serious.

In fact, I would say, if they are accurate, somebody in the Corps of Engineers ought to be court-martialed or fired—or whatever you do to them—or shot—or whatever is the appropriate punishment. According to you they fabricated these economic justifications.

Colonel GULLATT. No, sir. I never said they fabricated it. I do not impugn the integrity of the Corps of Engineers. I believe they are the finest public servants you have, gentlemen.

Mr. SMITH. Well, you use the words, "grossly erroneous" or something like that, which is the same as fabricated.

Colonel GULLATT. When I went into West Point, the first thing they told me was I was grossly ignorant.

Mr. JONES. A lot of people tell us Members of Congress that—and with greater frequency, too.

Colonel GULLATT. No, sir. I want to make it very clear to you. I think the Corps of Engineers is the finest public body you have working for you—and I have all the faith and confidence in the Corps of Engineers—but I know that they are big enough so that if they have made a mistake they are willing to admit it. But you have to give them a chance.

When I was in the Corps of Engineers and I was told to build a dam, I did it. You people give me the money and give me orders to do it and you will get a dam built, and you will get your money's worth. But whether it is economically justified and feasible, I think the Congress is responsible for looking into that.

I have so recommended in this statement I have made to you. I have recommended the reconsideration of these projects.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Mack reminds me that we only authorize the projects that are recommended by the Corps of Engineers.

Colonel GULLATT. That is right.

Mr. DAVIS. After they have made their study.

Colonel GULLATT. Yes.

Mr. HARGIS. Mr. Chairman, the Army engineer representative is sitting here. Does he think he made a mistake now?

Mr. DAVIS. No; General Person will not admit it. How could General Person make a mistake?

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Edmondson.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I just wanted to ask Mr. Gullatt if he felt that he spoke for the railroads of the area of the Arkansas River when he makes this attack upon the evaluation of the Corps of Engineers and their recommendation for navigation on the Arkansas River?

Colonel GULLATT. I do.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Do you speak for the Midland Valley Railroad?

Colonel GULLATT. Well, only through the Association of American Railroads. I cannot specifically answer that question for you, but I speak for 90 percent of them, I will say.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Do you speak for the Kansas, Oklahoma & Gulf Railway Co.?

Colonel GULLATT. No; I definitely do not for the president.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Do you speak for the Oklahoma City-Ada-Atoka Railway?

Colonel GULLATT. I don't know whether they are a member of our organization or not.

Mr. EDMONDSON. They are three of the railroads which are in the Arkansas Basin and they are strong supporters of navigation on the Arkansas River. They are members of the Arkansas Basin Association.

Colonel GULLATT. But I do speak for the great railroads in the basin.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Do you speak for the Missouri, Kansas & Texas Railroad?

Colonel GULLATT. Yes, through the AAR.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Do you think they are opposed to this project?

Colonel GULLATT. Yes; sure they are.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Do you understand that some of their directors are members of the Arkansas Basin Association?

Colonel GULLATT. I do not doubt but that you might find a director from the railroad who would participate in the development of the Arkansas Basin. You will find some directors dissenting in any corporation.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The president of the Midland Valley Railroad and the Kansas, Oklahoma & Gulf Railway is a member of the Arkansas Basin Association and they are enthusiastic boosters of the program and enthusiastic supporters of this justification. Those are roads that serve the area that this navigation program is planned upon. I do not think you speak for the railroads that actually serve the immediate area of the Arkansas River.

Colonel GULLATT. Would you like me to submit to this committee the names of the railroads I do represent?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think that those you do represent that serve the Arkansas Basin would be pertinent. It would be interesting to see who the railroads are that oppose it.

Colonel GULLATT. I will be very glad to furnish them to you.

(The information requested is as follows:)

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN RAILROADS,
Washington, D.C., June 3, 1959.

Hon. CLIFFORD DAVIS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Flood Control, House Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DAVIS: There are forwarded herewith the data to be included in the record, which were requested by the committee as a result of the testimony that I gave on May 27, 1959, before the Subcommittee on Flood Control of the House Committee on Public Works. The complete list of the member railroads of the Association of American Railroads is furnished, with the railroads that operate in the Arkansas River Basin indicated.

Respectfully,

DOSWELL GULLATT.

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN RAILROADS

MEMBERS

Akron, Canton & Youngstown Railroad
Algoma Central & Hudson Bay Railway
Alton & Southern Railroad
Ann Arbor Railroad
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway;[1]
Lines east of Albuquerque
Coast lines:
Gulf, Colorado & Santa Fe Railway
Panhandle & Santa Fe Railway
Atlanta & St. Andrews Bay Railway
Atlantic Coast Line Railroad
Baltimore & Ohio Chicago Terminal Railroad
Baltimore & Ohio Railroad
Staten Island Rapid Transit Railway
Bangor & Aroostook Railroad
Belt Railway Co. of Chicago
Bessemer & Lake Erie Railroad
Boston & Maine Railroad
Sullivan County Railroad
Vermont Valley Railroad
Buffalo Creek Railroad
Cambria & Indiana Railroad
Canadian National Railways
Lines in Canada
Lines in United States:
Canadian National Lines in New England
Duluth, Winnipeg & Pacific Railway
Champlain & St. Lawrence Railroad
United States & Canada Railroad
St. Clair Tunnel
Central Vermont Railway, Inc.
Grand Trunk Western Railroad
Vermont & Province Line
New York-Niagara Frontier
Minnesota & Manitoba Railroad (leased line)
Canadian Pacific Railway:
Lines in Canada:
Dominion Atlantic Railway.
Quebec Central Railway
Lines in United States:
Canadian Pacific Lines in Vermont
Canadian Pacific Lines in Maine
Central of Georgia Railway
Central Railroad Co. of New Jersey:
Wharton & Northern Railroad
Charleston & Western Carolina Railway
Chesapeake & Ohio Railway
Chicago & Eastern Illinois Railroad
Chicago & Illinois Midland Railway
Chicago & North Western Railway
Litchfield & Madison Railway
Chicago & Western Indiana Railroad
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad
Chicago Great Western Railway
Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railroad[1]
Peoria Terminal Co.
Chihuahua-Pacific Railway
Clinchfield Railroad
Colorado & Southern Railway
Columbus & Greenville Railway
Delaware & Hudson Railroad Corp.
Greenwich & Johnsonville Railway

See footnotes at end of list.

Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad
Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad
Detroit & Mackinac Railway
Detroit & Toledo Shore Line Railroad
Detroit, Toledo & Ironton Railroad
Direccion General de Ferrocarriles en Operacion
    Ferrocarril Sonora-Baja California
    Ferrocarril del Sureste.
Duluth, Missabe & Iron Range Railway
Duluth, South Shore & Atlantic Railroad
Elgin, Joliet & Eastern Railway
Erie Railroad
Ferrocarril Del Pacifico, S.A. de C.V. (Pacific Railroad)
Florida East Coast Railway
Fort Worth & Denver Railway
Galveston, Houston & Henderson Railroad
Georgia Railroad
Georgia & Florida Railroad
Great Northern Railway
Green Bay & Western Railroad
Gulf, Mobile & Ohio Railroad
Houston Belt & Terminal Railway
Illinois Central Railroad
Illinois Terminal Railroad
Indianapolis Union Railway
Kansas City Southern Railway [1]
    Arkansas Western Railway
Kentucky & Indiana Terminal Railroad
Lake Superior & Ishpeming Railroad
Lehigh & New England Railroad
Lehigh Valley Railroad
Long Island Railroad
Louisiana & Arkansas Railway [1]
Louisville & Nashville Railroad
McCloud River Railroad
Maine Central Railroad
Manufacturers Railway (St. Louis)
Mexican Railway
Midland Valley Railroad [1]
    Kansas, Oklahoma & Gulf Railway
    Oklahoma City-Ada-Atoka Railway
Minneapolis & St. Louis Railway
Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railroad (Soo Line Railroad)
    Wisconsin Central Railway
Mississippi Central Railroad
Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railroad [1]
    Missouri-Kansas-Tex. Railroad Co. of Texas
    Beaver, Meade & Englewood Railroad
Missouri Pacific Railroad [1]
    Missouri-Illinois Railroad
Monon Railroad
Montour Railroad
National Railways of Mexico
Nevada Northern Railway
New York Central Railroad
    Chicago River & Indiana Railroad
    Indiana Harbor Belt Railroad
    Pittsburgh & Lake Erie Railroad
New York, Chicago & St. Louis Railroad
New York, New Haven, & Hartford Railroad
Norfolk & Western Railway
Norfolk Southern Railway
Northern Pacific Railway
Northwestern Pacific Railroad
Ontario Northland Railway

See footnotes at end of list.

Pennsylvania Railroad
  Pennsylvania & Atlantic Railroad
  Rosslyn Connecting Railroad
  Waynesburg & Washington Railroad
  Baltimore & Eastern Railroad
Pennsylvania-Reading Seashore Lines
Peoria & Pekin Union Railway
Piedmont & Northern Railway
Pittsburg & Shawmut Railroad
Pittsburgh & West Virginia Railway
Prescott & Northwestern Railroad
Pullman Co. (special membership)
Railway Express Agency, Inc. (special membership)
Raritan River Railroad
Reading Co.
  Trenton-Princeton Traction Co.
Richmond, Fredericksburg, & Potomac Railroad
Rutland Railway
St. Louis-San Francisco Railway [1]
  Birmingham Belt Railroad
  St. Louis, San Francisco & Texas Railway
St. Louis Southwestern Railway [1]
  St. Louis Southwestern Railway of Texas
  Dallas Terminal Railway & Union Depot Co.
  Shreveport Bridge & Terminal Co.
San Diego & Arizona Eastern Railway
Savannah & Atlanta Railway
Seaboard Air Line Railroad
Southern Pacific Co.
  Texas & New Orleans Railroad
Southern Railway:
  Alabama Great Southern Railroad
  Atlanta & East Carolina Railway
  Carolina & Northwestern Railway
  Cincinnati, New Orleans & Texas Pacific Railway
  Georgia Southern & Florida Railway
  Harriman & Northeastern Railroad
  Live Oak, Perry & Gulf Railroad
  New Orleans & Northeastern Railroad
  New Orleans Terminal Co.
  St. Johns River Terminal Co.
  State University Railroad
  Woodstock & Blocton Railway
Spokane International Railroad
Spokane, Portland, & Seattle Railway
Tennessee, Alabama, & Georgia Railway
Terminal Railroad Association of St. Louis
Texas & Pacific Railway
Texas Mexican Railway
Toledo, Peoria, & Western Railroad
Toronto, Hamilton, & Buffalo Railway
Tremont & Gulf Railway
Union Pacific Railroad
Union Railway (Memphis)
Union Railroad (Pittsburgh)
Virginian Railway
Wabash Railroad
Western Maryland Railway
Western Pacific Railroad
Western Railway of Alabama
  Atlanta & West Point Railroad
Winston-Salem Southbound Railway
Youngstown & Southern Railway

[1] Railroads serving portions of the territory tributary to the proposed Arkansas-Verdigris-Canadian Rivers navigation project.

Mr. EDMONDSON. And we would like to see them come out from under the rocks down there if they are opposed to it and let us know who they are, because many of their officials and directors and officers are enthusiastic participants in this development program in Oklahoma and Arkansas. I think you may be speaking for railroads a long ways away from the Arkansas River who are opposed to this development program.

Mr. HARGIS. I would like to join with Mr. Edmondson here. I have been a member of this tri-State committee and we have been active for several years in the State of Kansas and I have not found this opposition in all the time I have been a member of that committee.

Colonel GULLATT. But I believe you will find in the last year that a committee which represented the railroads operating in the Arkansas Valley submitted to the Appropriations Committee a paper objecting to the expenditure of further funds for navigation.

Mr. HARGIS. Not in our organization down there for the three-State area. I am not talking about the Congress but the three-State area now.

Colonel GULLATT. I do not know about the three-State area because I am not a member and I do not know who is a member.

Mr. HARGIS. The ones Mr. Edmondson was talking about are members.

Colonel GULLATT. I am sure you might find some railroad officials that might be members of those committees. I am sure of it. Yes. They might very reasonably be, but that is not the policy of the railroad at the same time. One member of this committee does not make the policy of the committee.

Mr. DAVIS. You are certainly right. Without objection the statement of Colonel Gullatt will be made a part of the record at this point. You filed with the committee staff yesterday quite a lengthy memorandum. We will make that an exhibit but not a part of the hearings. You understand that. Because it is rather expensive to reproduce all of that material and we are going to use your oral statement plus your formal statement which will be made a part of the record.

Colonel GULLATT. Mr. Davis, may I state that those three statements I submitted to you have all been made a part of the record before the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. DAVIS. Well, it will not be necessary then.

Colonel GULLATT. And it will be published in the record of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. DAVIS. Fine. Then it will not be necessary for us to repeat that cost.

Colonel GULLATT. Gentlemen, I have a few other things to say. May I just summarize this a little bit more. How much more time do I have, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. DAVIS. Go ahead. It will not take you much longer, I am sure.

Colonel GULLATT. We have talked about the Arkansas River but let me talk to you about the Arkansas River economic justification and have you ask me some questions on it.

The Arkansas River multiple-purpose project as originally approved by the Congress, and that is when the Corps of Engineers recommended it, was estimated by the Corps of Engineers to cost $436.1 million, but it is now estimated by the Corps of Engineers to

cost $1.2 billion. Proposed additions and extensions to the present project now under study will further increase the cost of the Arkansas to at least $2 billion. These proposed additions and extensions are up to Oklahoma City where they are going to pump water to float barges. According to my estimate it will be $2 billion.

This committee is now requested by the Corps of Engineers to approve an increase of $125 million in the present authorization for multiple-purpose projects on the Arkansas River. Such authorizations should not even be considered until detailed basic data indicate clearly the authorization is in the public interest.

Mr. Chairman, I presume one reason why you gentlemen recommend these authorizations is to keep some control over the expenditures on the projects. If not, why not authorize the money for the whole project for the full time? So for the corps just to come up and ask for additional authorizations because they need it, I do not think is justification.

I have prepared a written statement which I wish to present at this time and request that it be made a part of this record.

Mr. DAVIS. That has already been done.

Colonel GULLATT. This statement will show to you that no bona fide economic evaluation of the navigation features of this project, the Arkansas River project, has ever been made by the Corps of Engineers since it established a 1.01 to 1 benefit-cost ratio estimate on December 31, 1943, the evaluation considered by the Congress when it authorized the project by Public Law 525, 79th Congress, 2d session, on July 24, 1946.

Despite that fact the Corps of Engineers admittedly without a bona fide evaluation—and, of course, that is my opinion. Your opinion may be different—sometime during the year 1954 arbitrarily increased the tonnages and savings upon which the project was authorized from 9 million tons and $19 million savings, to 13 million tons and $40 million savings. I have been trying to get that information and the details on why and how that was done, and I have been unsuccessful.

The analyses and estimates made by the Corps of Engineers on civil works projects have on previous occasions been questioned and condemned by various committees of the Congress as lacking validity. In the case of the Tennessee-Tombigbee report and in the case of the Missouri River report, Congress investigated and found it was not correct.

Mr. SMITH. Will the gentleman yield?

Colonel GULLATT. Yes. sir.

Mr. SMITH. Colonel, you said Congress investigated the Tombigbee.

Colonel GULLATT. Well, a congressional committee.

Mr. SMITH. A committee did?

Colonel GULLATT. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMITH. It is a pretty broad statement to say a committee did.

Colonel GULLATT. I understand, Mr. Congressman. A congressional committee did. The estimated cost of the Arkansas River project has increased from $436.1 million when authorized in 1946, to $1.2 billion in 1959, a figure which is approximately 275 percent of the original estimate. Certainly such an increased cost calls for a completely new evaluation of costs and possible related benefits, if there

be any. The unsupported statements by witnesses of the Corps of Engineers with sketchy and inadequate supporting data are not sound bases for continued increase in authorizations.

Gentlemen, that project has doubled in cost, and there has been no economic evaluation of it since 1943. They have made some figures and escalated some figures but certainly the project is now in the process of construction and they are beginning to construct the first of the locks and dams for navigation. Navigation represents 80 percent of that project and certainly it seems as though it should be reinvestigated before any great amount of money is spent on it.

Here is one of the reasons why I say it should be reinvestigated.

Brig. Gen. William Whipple, division engineer, southwest division of the Corps of Engineers, summed up the status of the Arkansas River project and pointed out the lack of definite data, planning, and programing of the project in a speech which was reported by the Tulsa World dated November 26, 1958, wherein it is stated that—

> As far as proceeding with the gigantic project is concerned, the military construction agency, according to Whipple, now has "more money than time and more time than answers."

Mr. EDMONDSON. I wonder if the gentleman will present the complete speech of General Whipple and place it in the record at this point, which speech strongly supports the Arkansas River project and which fills in the gaps in what you have quoted here.

Colonel GULLATT. I was unable to get all of it.

Mr. EDMONDSON. You have omitted a significant paragraph from the Tulsa World which goes on to include what he has to say about the river, and I think that those significant paragraphs ought to be added to what you are saying about it.

Colonel GULLATT. If I may, the whole thing is included—the whole report of the Tulsa World is included in one of these papers I submitted to the committee.

Mr. EDMONDSON. That has already been made a part of the Appropriations Committee record I understand.

Colonel GULLATT. And the whole article from the Tulsa World is made a part of it there.

Mr. EDMONDSON. For example, in this second paragraph which you quote here in which he makes mention of the excavation of the sediment in the river bottom, unless I am mistaken, in that speech he went on to say that has indicated the possibility of eliminating some considerable cost of construction through a bank stabilization program along the river. That is a pretty significant omission from what you have supplied to this subcommittee.

Colonel GULLATT. Yes, sir. I had no intent to convey any misunderstanding with reference to it, but I am just saying that the plans—I said the plans and the programing, and so forth, are not complete.

Mr. EDMONDSON. What you omitted to say though was that under their new plans that they are working up on it they are devising some methods to save a considerable amount of money in the construction. This is what you omit from the statement of General Whipple which you are quoting here.

Colonel GULLATT. But before we authorize additional funds to go ahead, Mr. Edmondson, should not those plans be ready so you know what you are authorizing the money for?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think any engineering group which did not take cognizance of new developments and new approaches to problems as they went along with an authorized project and did not plan accordingly or modify the plans accordingly to take advantage of those new techniques—which they are talking about doing on bank stabilization down there—would certainly be a pretty lousy organization.

Colonel GULLATT. I agree with you.

Mr. EDMONDSON. And nobody can say that about the Corps of Engineers. When they figure out a way to do something better they adapt their plans immediately to take advantage of it. That is what they are doing in the Arkansas River and if you had quoted from General Whipple's speech in entirety that would have been made clear.

Colonel GULLATT. I was not able to get his entire speech, but I do not question your statement. I am just pointing out there are many pertinent facts in connection with the Arkansas River that should be considered before we just automatically authorize more money and more money and more money.

Mr. DAVIS. Surely you had available the whole speech if you are quoting some excerpts from it.

Colonel GULLATT. I have the whole report. I submitted the entire report of the Tulsa World in connection with the speech. I would be very happy if the gentleman here would introduce the whole speech. I will be very happy to have a copy of it.

Mr. DAVIS. That is up to you.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Clark.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Gullatt made some very broad statements with respect to the reasoning behind the authorization of this committee to the Army Engineers. May I say first of all the real reason behind authorizing many projects before this committee, which the Corps of Engineers have brought to the committee, is the need to stop the millions and millions of dollars in damages and the loss of life occasioned by floods which, of course, as you know far exceeds any amount of money that this project or any project might cost.

I think that should be brought into the picture because you have made some very broad statements as to why we authorize projects that you do not think should be authorized.

Colonel GULLATT. Mr. Clark, I have in no place commented upon water resources development, in general. I believe in water resources development, economic water resources development of all types, and I think the Association of American Railroads does, too, I am sure.

But we have no quarrel to pick with the economical projects, the projects that are proven to be economically justifiable. I believe projects should be looked upon from the standpoint of the good of the whole country. There are good projects but I am contending that these three projects are not good for the whole country because we are wasting our resources on something which will bring us in no return.

Mr. DAVIS. Without objection from the committee we will consider your full statement in executive session as soon as we will be able to examine the brief which is already made a part of the Appropriations record.

Colonel GULLATT. Thank you very much. Yes, sir.

Mr. DAVIS. General Person, one question. Mr. Brennan requested me to inquire if the central Florida project will be out of authorization money in 1962?

General PERSON. It will be short, I believe $822,000.

Mr. DAVIS. Thank you. We will go into executive session.

(Whereupon, at 10:45 a.m., the subcommittee went into executive session.)

×